

THE
ECLECTIC REVIEW

FOR MAY, 1846.

- Art. I.—1. *Die Briefe Pauli an die Korinther bearbeitet.* Von L. J. Rückert. Leipzig, 1836, 7. 2 Theile, 8vo.
2. *Kurze Erklärung der Briefe an die Korinther.* Von Dr. W. M. L. de Wette. Zweite verbesserte Ausgabe. Leipzig, 1845, 8vo.
3. *Paulus, der Apostel Jesu Christi, sein Leben und Wirken, seine Briefe und seine Lehre.* Von Dr. F. C. Baur. Stuttgart: 1845, 8vo.
4. *Die Parteiungen in der Gemeinde zu Korinth.* Von F. Becker. Altona, 1842, 8vo.
5. *De ecclesia Corinthiaca primaeva factionibus turbata. Disquisitio critico-historia, &c.* Dan. Schenkel. Basel, 1838, 8vo.
6. *Theologische Studien und Kritiken.* Jahrgang, 1830, drittes Heft, pp. 614—632. Von Dr. Bleek.

CORINTH, as is well known, was situated on the isthmus between the Ægean and Ionian seas. It was the capital of Achaia, distinguished by the celebration of the Isthmian games in its vicinity, and equally noted for its arts, wealth, and luxury. Hence Cicero styled it the 'Light of Greece.' About the year 146 B.C., it was destroyed by Mummius; but Julius Cæsar caused it to be rebuilt and peopled with a Roman colony. Its favourable situation in relation to commerce soon secured a flourishing trade. Hence it rapidly regained its former splendor, in connexion with its former vice and licentiousness. The testimony of heathen writers is unanimous not only with respect to the learning and culture of the inhabitants, but also their wealth, effeminacy, and impurity. The gross worship of Venus,

who had a renowned temple in the place, furnishes melancholy proof of debasement and degradation, notwithstanding the schools of learning and the philosophers on which, as Aristides says, a person stumbled at every step. Hence Dio Chrysostom calls it a city 'the most licentious of all that are or have been;' so that the verb *κορινθιάζειν* was synonymous with *to be lewd*. This city, the centre of eastern and western commerce, was selected by the apostle Paul as the scene of his labours for a considerable period. The number and character of the inhabitants, added to the importance of its situation and the conflux of so many strangers into it, rendered a permanent lodgment for Christianity within it highly desirable, that the truth might pervade neighbouring not less than distant nations. No station could have been selected more favourable to the diffusion of the new religion through the Roman empire. The circumstances belonging to it were such as none other city presented. Hence the great apostle chose it as the sphere of his unwearied activity for eighteen months. Here he laboured in company with several associates, amid the opulence, the luxury, the licentiousness, and the learning of the idolatrous inhabitants. Nor were his efforts without success. It may be readily imagined that many Jews had settled in it for the purposes of traffic, from whom the apostle received, as in other places, much opposition. Yet some chief men among them believed, such as Crispus and Sosthenes, although there is no reason for supposing that many such had become converts. The Christian church collected by Paul consisted chiefly of the poorer class:—Not many wise men after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble were called.

On his second missionary journey, the apostle Paul came from Athens to Corinth, where he remained eighteen months. Here he found Aquila and his wife Priscilla, who had lately come from Italy, because Claudius the emperor had expelled the Jews from Rome. The Romans did not distinguish Christians from Jews; and therefore the former no less than the latter were included in the edict. (Suet. vit. Claud. cap. 25.) In Aquila's house he took up his abode, and wrought at the same manual employment, both being tent-makers. It is not clear whether Aquila was converted to Christianity *at* Corinth, or *before his arrival*. It cannot certainly be inferred from the expression *τῆς Ἰουδαίας* in Acts xviii. 2, that he was not then a Christian; for the phrase merely marks *the nation* to which he belonged. The probability is, that he had been already converted at Rome along with his wife Priscilla. Still his Christian knowledge could not have been other than imperfect and limited. It must have been greatly enlarged by the closeness of relation in which it was his happiness to stand towards Paul at Ephesus.

In consequence of his association with the apostle, he became acquainted with the doctrines of Christianity so as to be able to instruct Apollos, explaining to him the way of God more perfectly.

According to Paul's custom, he addressed himself in the first instance to the Jews, who had a synagogue in the city. Thither he repaired on the Sabbath-day and preached Christ. His discourses appear to have made a saving impression on the minds of several Jews and proselytes, especially Crispus, chief ruler of the synagogue, who believed in the Lord, with all his house. After Timothy and Silas had come from Macedonia, he became bolder, and testified more plainly that Jesus was the Christ. High offence was now taken to his doctrine by the unbelieving Jews, who contradicted and blasphemed. He therefore turned to the Gentiles, and ceased to frequent the synagogue. But the great success of his labours among the Gentile inhabitants exasperated the Jews so much, that they seized and dragged him before the tribunal of Gallio the Roman proconsul, accusing him of opposition to the law of Moses. The governor wisely and properly refused to interfere in ecclesiastical matters as lying beyond his province. Even after this insurrection we are informed that he remained still a *good many days*; at the expiration of which he sailed to Syria, in company with Aquila and Priscilla, (Acts xviii. 18.) leaving, perhaps, his faithful assistants Timothy and Silas in Corinth, together with a numerous church chiefly composed of Gentile converts of the poorer class. While the apostle was passing through Galatia and Phrygia, Apollos, an Alexandrian Jew, removed to Corinth, and mightily contributed to the advancement of Christianity in that city. This eloquent preacher had been instructed in the gospel previously to his coming thither, by Aquila and Priscilla. (xviii. 24—28.) After the apostle had come from Galatia to Ephesus, the second time, he received unfavourable reports of the Corinthian church from some members belonging to the household of Chloe. (1 Cor. i. 11.) Perhaps also Apollos, who appears to have come to Ephesus while the apostle resided there, gave him information respecting the distractions at Corinth. In consequence of these representations Paul had resolved to take a journey through Macedonia and Achaia to Jerusalem, and sent Timothy and Erastus into these parts both to forward the collection among the Gentile churches, for the relief of the poor Hebrew Christians at Jerusalem, and also to rectify the irregularities of the Corinthian Church; when messengers arrived, viz, Stephanas, Fortunatus, and Achaicus, bringing a letter concerning several doctrines and practices, and requesting a solution to various questions. By this means he obtained a knowledge of the

contentions in the church at Corinth, the viciousness of the members, and the great disorder into which it had fallen. Such was the occasion of writing the first letter, which he sent by the hands of Stephanas, Fortunatus, and Achaicus. It was Paul's wish that Apollos should accompany the bearers, and use his endeavours to heal the distractions that had arisen; but the latter decidedly refused, conscious perhaps that his presence might rather foment than allay dissension.

Some have thought that Timothy was the bearer of the letter, but this opinion appears to be incorrect. He is mentioned in 1 Cor. xvi. 10, and iv. 17, in such a way as to intimate, that he was *not* the bearer, and that Paul did not expect him to arrive at Corinth till after the Epistle, *εάν ἔλθῃ Τιμόθεος*. Timothy had been dispatched before the writing of the Epistle, for, had he been with the apostle at that time, he would most probably have been specified in the salutation at the commencement. His going into Macedonia could naturally lead the apostle to conclude that he would not arrive at Corinth till after the letter's reception.

It is matter of debate, whether Timothy actually visited Corinth after collecting the contributions in Macedonia. Certainly it was the apostle's intention that he should go to the city. We know, however, that he had returned during the writing of the second Epistle to the Corinthians and was then with Paul; for he is mentioned in the salutation. According to Bleek, Timothy had been in Corinth; and on his return to Ephesus, communicated to Paul important information relative to the church, to what he himself had done, and the effects of the letter already sent. He supposes that Timothy himself was probably the bearer. It appears to us, however, that Timothy had been sent away previously to the first letter, and that he was also prevented from going to Corinth. In Acts xix. 22, he is said to have been dispatched into Macedonia, without any allusion to Achaia; and in the second Epistle to the Corinthians, no reference is made to Timothy's visit, to the manner in which he had been received, or the information which had been communicated to the writer founded on the personal observation of his friend. It is more probable, therefore, that Timothy, owing to some unknown circumstances, did not go as far as Corinth.

It has also been debated, whether the apostle had visited Corinth *once* or *twice* before he wrote to the inhabitants; and whether there be any reason to conclude that he sent them a letter antecedently to the two extant epistles. We shall attend to both points in order.

I. Did the apostle undertake a second journey to Corinth before writing to the Corinthians? This question has been

answered in the affirmative by Chrysostom, Ecumenius, Theophylact, Erasmus, Baronius, Mill, Tillemont, Schulz, Michaelis, Schmidt, Leun, Schrader, Koehler, Bleek, J. G. Müller, Lücke, Schott, Scheckenburger, Neander, Anger, Billroth, and Olshausen. The Acts of the Apostles do not notice such a visit. A knowledge of it is derived from certain passages in the epistles to the Corinthians, such as 2 Cor. xiii. 1, 2; xii. 14; ii. 1; xii. 21; 1 Cor. xvi. 7. The first two are mainly relied on. The second two are adduced by *some* advocates of the hypothesis. The last text is mentioned by a very few writers with the same view. The places in question must be examined separately. But before proceeding to their investigation it may be necessary to state, that the supposed second visit could not have happened between the composition of the two extant epistles, because the first was written near the close of the apostle's abode at Ephesus, and the second in his journey through Macedonia, probably at Philippi, a journey which he undertook after leaving Ephesus. The two visits must both have been antecedent to the *first* epistle addressed to the Corinthians.

2 Cor. xiii. 1, 2. 'This is the third time I am coming to you. In the mouth of two or three witnesses shall every word be established. I told you before, and foretell you, as if I were present, the second time; and being absent, now I write to them which heretofore have sinned, and to all other, that if I come again, I will not spare.' These words, considered by themselves, are sufficiently obvious. They express the idea that the apostle purposed to pay a *third* visit.

2 Cor. xii. 14. 'Behold, the third time I am ready to come to you, and I will not be burdensome to you: for I seek yours, not you, &c.' Here *τρίτον* refers to *ἐλθεῖν*, as the connexion evinces.

2 Cor. ii. 1. 'But I determined this with myself, that I would not come again to you in heaviness.' Paul had not come to them in sorrow, as we learn from Acts xviii. 1. Some subsequent visit therefore of a sorrowful character must be referred to. Neither can it be said that he was humbled on the occasion of his first visit (xii. 21).

1 Cor. xvi. 7. 'For I will not see you now by the way; but I trust to tarry awhile with you, if the Lord permit.' These words seem to intimate, that his future visit to the Corinthians would be of some continuance, as opposed to the *passing visit* he had previously paid. But when first at Corinth, he staid nearly two years, and therefore he must have been with them afterwards for a very short time, before these words were written.

Such are the passages which have been thought to imply a second visit previously to the writing of the first epistle. We shall

show in the first place, that the last three texts do not support the prevailing hypothesis; and secondly, we intend to subject the first two to a rigorous examination, so as to render it apparent that they also are not a secure foundation on which to build it.

In regard to 2 Cor. ii. 1, it has been disputed, whether *πάλιν* belongs to *ἔλθεῖν* singly, or to *ἐν λύπῃ πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἔλθεῖν*. The received reading *πάλιν ἔλθεῖν ἐν λύπῃ πρὸς ὑμᾶς* favours the former; the more approved reading *πάλιν ἐν λύπῃ πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἔλθεῖν*, harmonizes better with the latter. It is a matter of little consequence whether the one or the other be adopted. Paul's coming again to them in sorrow is contrasted with his leaving them in sorrow. He could not have been with them so long as not to perceive elements at work which threatened to disturb and rend the church. Hence arose his comparative regret.

2 Cor. xii. 21. Here it is undoubtedly more natural to join *πάλιν* with *ἐλθόντα* than with the verb *ταπεινώσῃ*. In this way no previous humbling is alluded to. There is simply a reference to the possibility of his being humbled at the time of his coming again to the Corinthians. Admitting, however, that *πάλιν* belongs to *ταπεινώσῃ*, the passage does not prove a second visit to Corinth. The humiliation in question was that which he had felt at some part of his first stay which lasted more than a year and a half. Every thing which he saw in the Corinthian church did not please him. It would be unreasonable to suppose, that he had not occasionally perceived cause for self-abasement and sorrow.

1 Cor. xvi. 7. These words do not imply that the apostle had really paid a passing visit to Corinth. The sense is: 'I do not wish to see you now merely as I am passing on to some other place; I am rather hoping that I shall be able to spend some time with you.' In the preceding verse he says, '*perhaps* I shall continue with you or even pass the winter at Corinth.' In the present passage, he expresses his *desire* and *intention* to abide with them for a considerable period, although the accomplishment of his purpose was greatly dependent on external circumstances.

The passing visit may be referred to the short period which *he purposed* to spend with the Corinthians. On comparing 2 Cor. i. 15, 16, we learn, that Paul had formerly purposed to go first to Corinth, then to Macedonia, and then to return to Corinth; but it appears from 1 Cor. xvi. 5, that his determination was changed. To this short period, which, if his purpose had been carried out, he would have spent with them, he opposes his present intended visit of some length, (1 Cor. xvi. 7). The adverb *ἄρτι* belongs to *ἰδεῖν* not to *θέλω*.

2 Cor. xiii. 1, 2. The first verse of this passage we explain by

the aid of 2 Cor. xii. 14. 'This is the third time I am coming to you,' *i. e.* this is the third time I am *ready*, or *prepared to come*. The *τρίτον τοῦτο ἔρχομαι* of the one passage, is explained by the *τρίτον ἐτείμως ἔχω* of the other. If the journey in which he had been disappointed was reckoned one of the times, then the present would be *the third time* at which *he was ready* to come, although he had actually been at Corinth but once. It cannot be denied, that *ἔρχομαι* may signify, *I am purposing*, or *prepared to come*; and certainly the parallel passage (xii. 14.) favours this sense. 'In the mouth of two or three witnesses shall every word be established,' *i. e.* 'every threatening word will be fulfilled as surely as what is supported by two or three witnesses is true.' The second verse has been differently punctuated by different interpreters. All, however, agree, that *γράφω* should be expunged. Bleek and Schrader divide the words thus: *προεῖρηκα καὶ προλέγω, ὡς παρὼν τὸ δεύτερον, καὶ ἅπῃ νῦν, τοῖς προημαρτηκόσι καὶ τοῖς κ. τ. λ.* The explanation given is this: 'I have told you before, when I was present with you a second time, and foretell as I did when present the second time, though now absent, to those who had sinned and to all the rest, that if I come again I will not spare.' The *τοῖς προημαρτηκόσι* is referred to *προεῖρηκα*; the *τοῖς λοιποῖς πᾶσιν* to *προλέγω*—those who had sinned at the time of his second visit; all others who have since erred.

But the interpunction in question does not necessarily lead to the interpretation given. The context implies that Paul had seen several things in the Corinthian church during his last residence among them with which he had not been pleased—that some persons had fallen into sin, and that he had been sparing in his rebukes, not proceeding to extremities, but threatening that unless certain vices were remedied, he should not spare at the time of his next coming. The verb *προεῖρηκα* need not be referred exclusively or chiefly to the apostle's last visit to Corinth. Some particulars in this very letter will serve to make it probable that the word in question alludes to these indirect reproofs more than to what had been spoken by word of mouth. Perhaps there is an especial allusion to 2 Cor. xii. 20, 21; or should the allusion be referred to the *first* epistle, as some think, then will 1 Cor. x. 2, be mainly intended. The clause *ὡς παρὼν τὸ δεύτερον*, which immediately belongs to *προλέγω*, seems to favour the opinion that the writer had only been once at Corinth. The preposition of the compound verb *προλέγω* and the *ὡς* prefixed to *παρὼν* indicate, if we are not mistaken, that Paul had not been among his readers a second time. He *tells beforehand, as if* he were present the second time—such is his language—instead of, 'I tell

you *again* what I stated already, when with you a second time.' Τοῖς προσημαρτηκόσι καὶ τοῖς λοιποῖς πᾶσιν should be joined to προεῖρηκα καὶ προλέγω. The particle ὥς should be rendered *as if*, not *as*. It has the same signification in 1 Cor. v. 3. It is too artificial to refer, with Olshausen, the phrase ὥς παρὼν τὸ δεύτερον to προεῖρηκα alone, or to προλέγω alone. It belongs to both verbs. It is also too artificial to refer προσημαρτηκόσι to προεῖρηκα alone, and τοῖς λοιποῖς πᾶσιν to προλέγω alone. They belong equally to both verbs.

Griesbach puts ὥς παρὼν τὸ δεύτερον καὶ ἄπὼν νῦν in a parenthesis. This mode of division is neither favourable nor otherwise to the hypothesis of Bleek. The parenthesis should probably be removed, as the later editors have done. Both Lachmann and Tischendorf have expunged it.

But it is said that the context of 2 Cor. xii. 14, suggests a different acceptation both of the present passage and of itself. In the thirteenth verse Paul writes: 'For what is it wherein ye were inferior to other churches, except it be that I myself was not burdensome to you? forgive me this wrong.' Here the keen irony of the apostle is strongly expressed. He declares that he had not been burdensome to them when he was with them before. In the fourteenth verse he affirms, 'and I will not be burdensome to you,' at my next visit. Hence it is said, that there is a want of appropriateness attaching to the statement of his determination to go twice to the Corinthians. Whether he had resolved to go once or twice was of no moment. But if we suppose that *he had really been twice* at Corinth, the argumentation is thought to be apposite. The greater the number of his visits during which he had received no maintenance from the people, the more severe his irony. It would have been superfluous to state how often he had purposed to be among them; while it is quite consistent to mention *all* the visits on the supposition that his intention of visiting Corinth had not been disappointed, but that he *had been twice* in the city.

This reasoning is plausible, but not, perhaps, so forcible as has been assumed. The apostle in speaking of his visits to them, usually mentions his purposed visit; for though he was disappointed in performing it, it must be reckoned as great a proof of his interest in their welfare as if it had been really paid. He speaks of *it*, and of his first actual visit together, as evidences of his affection for them, and of zeal for their true benefit. His connecting the two shews that he *would have* taken no support from the Corinthians the second time any more than the first; and therefore the expression οὐ καταναρκήσω is equally applicable to both. 'I will not be burdensome to you any more than I was on my first visit, or *would have been* on my second.'

In this manner the appropriateness of mentioning his previously intended second visit along with the first which he really paid, may be clearly perceived. Thus the context is consistent with the supposition of but one visit. Hence *τρίτον* must be connected with *ἐτοίμως ἔχω*, not with *ἐλθεῖν* as the adherents of Bleek's hypothesis maintain.

The words of 2 Cor. i. 15, 16, present a serious obstacle to the hypothesis of a second visit: 'And in this confidence I was minded to come unto you before, that ye might have a second benefit; and to pass by you into Macedonia, and to come again out of Macedonia unto you, and of you to be brought on my way toward Judea.' Why should not the apostle speak uniformly and consistently in relation to the same subject? If his language presuppose two visits to Corinth, why should he speak of *one* benefit conferred by his personal presence during these *two visits*? Why not mention *two benefits*, and so have *τρίτην χάριν* in 2 Cor. i. 15?

Bleek, after Chrysostom, takes *χάρις* to be the same as *χαρά*, and *δεύτερος* as equivalent to *διπλοῦς*—'that ye might have a two-fold joy,'—the joy of seeing Paul twice, first on his way to Macedonia, then again on his return, as we learn from the sixteenth verse. But *χάρις* is not equivalent to *χαρά*, neither can *δεύτερος* be taken for *διπλοῦς*. The *usus loquendi* of the Greek language will not permit such a sense. It is easy to see that the proposed interpretation sets the passage aside as evidence either for *one* previous visit paid by Paul to Corinth, or for *two* previous visits, so reducing it to neutrality; but the exegesis is unnatural and arbitrary.

It will be observed, that the words *ἵνα δευτέραν χάριν ἔχητε* succeed *ἐβουλόμην πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἐλθεῖν πρότερον*, and *precede* the sixteenth verse by which they are partly explained. They ought, therefore, to be brought into harmony with the *preceding* context. It is improbable that *δευτέραν χάριν* should not be understood till after the sixteenth verse. The phrase manifestly alludes to the apostle's *first* presence at Corinth when he planted the church in that city. In speaking of the journey which he had purposed taking but was prevented, he speaks of his conferring a *second* benefit, whereas had he been twice present, he would naturally have spoken of a *third*. When he first lived among the Corinthians nearly two years, he had given them a first benefit; and the journey by which he had intended to bestow upon them a second benefit had not yet been made when he wrote the second letter. This is the obvious sense of the passage. It is contradictory to the interpretations assigned to 2 Cor. xiii. 1, 2, and xii. 14, by such as assume that Paul had been twice at Corinth before he wrote his epistles to the church at that place.

Many continental writers rejecting Bleek's mode of reconciling 2 Cor. i. 5, 6, with their favourite hypothesis, divide the one-and-half-year, during which Paul was first at Corinth, into two parts, supposing that he took a short excursion during it into the neighbouring parts. In this way he may be said to have come twice to Corinth, and so promises, in his second epistle, that he should come a *third* time. The apostle speaks of a *second* benefit, because during the greater part of the year-and-half he had taught at Corinth. Such is the interpretation of Baronius, Michaelis, Schulz, Leun, Schmidt, Schott, Anger, and others. To us, however, it seems unsatisfactory, because it makes the apostle speak *inconsistently*. At one time he mentions a *third* coming, or a *purpose* of coming a *third* time; whereas according to this exposition, he speaks of a *second* coming as a *second* benefit. This is not consistent in reference to the *same* visit.

The visit in question, i.e. the second, is assumed to be one of an unpleasant nature. Is it not strange then, that he never alludes in the first epistle to the admonitions and warnings which he had employed on that occasion. He must have acted as a reformer of abuses, and have spoken much of the disorder and dissensions he witnessed. And yet there is no reference to such conduct on his part, when he was last with the Corinthians. We say nothing of the difficulty which has been felt in finding a suitable place for inserting this second visit in the narrative of the Acts, nor of the arbitrariness of imagining that Luke did not speak of it because he was unacquainted with its existence. At whatever place it is inserted, whether at Acts xix. 1, as Neander conjectures, or in the three months stay in Hellas, (Acts xx. 2, 3,) as Koehler supposes:—whether we assume with Schrader, that Paul, after he had come to Ephesus where he remained three years, had made this second journey to Corinth, and returned before he wrote any letter to the Corinthians,—or agree with those who think that the second visit to Corinth took place immediately before he came a second time to Ephesus,—we say, at whatever place it is inserted, it must have the appearance of being *forcibly* put into the text of the Acts; although we readily concede that Luke omits various particulars which we learn from the epistles alone.

Thus the passages on which a second visit has been based, do not appear to us to prove its existence. One thing they *do* suggest, viz. that the apostle had discovered, during his long residence at Corinth, symptoms of ominous tendency, which awakened within his mind a deep solicitude. This circumstance shaded with melancholy his departure from the church.

II. It is an ancient opinion that a letter of Paul addressed to

the Corinthians has been lost. A passage in the first epistle has given rise to the sentiment ἔγραψα ὑμῖν ἐν τῇ ἐπιστολῇ, μὴ κ.τ.λ., translated in our version, 'I wrote to you in an epistle, not to company,' &c. The words just quoted form in the opinion of many, a basis too slender on which to build the hypothesis. There is no other passage containing a similar reference, for ἐπιστολαὶ in 2 Cor. x. 10, to which some have pointed, may refer to Paul's epistles generally, of whose character the Corinthians judged by the specimen they had received in the first. It is well known also, that the plural might be taken for the singular. We should not therefore *hastily* adopt the hypothesis on the sole ground of a single passage, or rather a single expression.

In regard to ἔγραψα we demur to the opinion that the aorist is ever equivalent strictly to the perfect. The verb γράφω indeed is used in a peculiar manner both in the Greek and Latin languages, a past tense of it being employed as a present. This however, does not apply to verbs in general. The instances adduced by Lardner, and others, of the aorist being employed for the present, fail to establish the point. Γράφω is an apparent exception to the general rule. So in latin *scripsi*. And yet, strictly speaking, a past tense of γράφω refers to past time, for when it is put at the termination of a letter it alludes to the *writing finished*. Thus the exception is *apparent* rather than *real*; and the position that a *past tense* is employed to designate *present time*, must be rejected in every case, as unphilosophical. Equally incorrect is the assertion that the aorist stands for the perfect. Ἐγραψα must be translated *I wrote*, not *I do write*, or *I have written*.

If the apostle refers to the letter he was then writing, it may be asked, to what part of it does he allude. Lardner regards the allusion as anticipative, and fixes upon the tenth chapter. This position is utterly untenable. Others think, that the second verse of the fifth chapter is meant, although no precept prohibiting associating with a fornicator is there given. Others again point to the fifth, sixth, and seventh verses, which are not appropriate, because they do not expressly enjoin upon the Corinthians for the first time, to excommunicate the incestuous person; but speak of *Paul himself as having already determined* to deliver such an one to Satan, as though he were present in spirit, and presiding over the meeting of the church at which this should take place. Here there is certainly an intimation to the Corinthian Christians that they should proceed to excommunicate the offender. Yet it is not such a direct injunction as would have been addressed to them *at first* on the subject; and besides, they are regarded merely as consenting; while Paul himself *virtually* excommunicates. The verb παραδοῦναι is connected with

κέκρικα. The antecedent context therefore does not seem appropriate, as that to which ἔγραψα refers. No part of it exhibits a prohibition to company with fornicators; but the whole contains a general exhortation to purity, and an assumption on the part of the writer that his readers should not delay to deliver, on his authority, the notorious offender to Satan. The expression τῇ ἐπιστολῇ must always appear strange to those who find the allusion in the context immediately preceding. What is the use of τῇ ἐπιστολῇ on the supposition that the second verse, or that the fifth, sixth or seventh verses are meant? It is utterly inexplicable.

But the eleventh verse is appealed to, in which ἔγραψα, the same tense as in the ninth, is found along with νυνὶ; the adverb being explanatory of ἐν τῇ ἐπιστολῇ and synonymous with it. Here, however, it is assumed, that νυνὶ is an adverb of time, as Morus, Pott, and Heydenreich, take it. But it is a transition-particle. If it were a particle of time, the association of it with ἔγραψα would be incongruous.

The article should certainly be translated *the* epistle. But this is still indefinite. Is it agreeable to the usus loquendi to understand it of the present epistle? In proof of the affirmative, Middleton refers to Romans xvi. 22, where τὴν ἐπιστολὴν means *the epistle to the Romans*. In like manner ἡ ἐπιστολὴ in Coloss. iv. 16, signifies, *the Colossian epistle*; τὴν ἐπιστολὴν in 1 Thessal. v. 27, *the first Thessalonian epistle*, and τῆς ἐπιστολῆς in 2 Thessal. iii. 14, *the second Thessalonian epistle*. These examples are not apposite. The expression ἡ ἐπιστολὴ occurs in them at *the end* of the writing. The letters in which the phrase appears are virtually finished. It means *the letter which I am now concluding*. This is quite different from the present instance, in which the same expression ἡ ἐπιστολὴ, so far from referring to a letter the composition of which is all but completed, is supposed to allude to the verses immediately preceding. *Parallelism* of examples is wanting. One important circumstance creates a distinction which sets aside the similarity. Ἡ ἐπιστολὴ can only denote *the present epistle*, when it is *virtually written*, not when it is towards the commencement. That it may denote *the former epistle*, is shewn by 2 Cor. vii. 8, where ἐν τῇ ἐπιστολῇ means what is now the first epistle to the Corinthians. The article prefixed to the noun signifies *the well-known* letter—the letter with which the readers were acquainted. Some affirm, that if the apostle had really meant to refer to a former letter he would have written ἐν τῇ προτέρᾳ ἐπιστολῇ, and not simply ἐν τῇ ἐπιστολῇ, but the assertion is refuted by 2 Cor. vii. 8.

Other arguments are adduced against the supposition of a lost epistle. It is thought unaccountable, for example, that the apostle should never notice in any other place the fact of his having written a letter to the Corinthians, or refer to its contents, in the same manner as he does in the second to the first. Why does not the writer allude to admonitions in this lost epistle, and charge his readers with direct disobedience to his injunctions?

Jones insists much on the improbability of a canonical book being lost. Lardner has also adduced various considerations affording presumptive evidence that 'no sacred writings of apostles composed for the instruction and edification of Christian people, their friends, and converts, could be easily lost.' But these writers reason on the ground that whatever apostles and evangelists wrote, was inspired and canonical. And yet apostles may have written at times when they were not under the peculiar influence of inspiration. An apostle's *conduct* was not always right, as we learn from that of Peter, who was reprimanded by Paul for hypocrisy. So also *every thing* that an apostle *wrote* may not have been dictated by the Holy Spirit or guided by his superintendence. It may *appear* inconsistent with the wisdom of the Deity, who employs no superfluous expenditure of means, that any epistle composed under his direction should soon be lost and forgotten. Still we may separate the canonical and inspired compositions of an apostle from occasional and uninspired writings proceeding from the same source.

The opinion that a lost epistle is alluded to, gave rise to one purporting to proceed from the Corinthians, and a reply to it from Paul. Both are spurious documents preserved in the Armenian language. They were first published in Armenian, by Masson, with a Latin translation by Wilkins, at Amsterdam, 1715; and reprinted by Fabricius, in his *Cod. Apocryphus N. T.* with La Croze's arguments to shew their spuriousness. Whiston defended their authenticity. Carpzov afterwards published them in Greek and Latin, with the notes of Whiston's two sons, William and George. Recently their authenticity has been defended by Rinck. But Ullmann has refuted his arguments. The epistles in question are evident forgeries; and it is strange that their authenticity should have found an advocate.

State of the Corinthian church.—A church gathered from among the inhabitants of Corinth may be supposed to have contained elements demanding special care and culture. Surrounded by immorality and prevailing licentiousness, it was difficult to preserve that purity which true Christianity requires. Established amid excessive corruption, the society soon fell into disorder. The seeds of former vice had not been wholly eradicated from the hearts of the converts. Former habits had left behind them a lingering influence,

which it was very difficult fully to subdue. Their piety was of a less steady and consistent character than it would probably have been, had their state before conversion been different. The depravity in which they once lived and moved, exerted a considerable power on their conduct, even after regeneration. In consequence of the prevailing degeneracy of their city, they were in greater danger of relapsing into the practices from which they had been saved. Rescued from abounding vice, they found it exceedingly difficult to maintain a high standard of moral excellence, because of the corrupt atmosphere in which their spiritual breath was drawn. Thus it has always been. Christianity does not at once and entirely deliver the soul from the sinful excesses in which that soul has indulged. It lays indeed the axe to the root of the tree ; but repeated strokes are necessary to prostrate the deep-rooted plant which has grown up large and luxuriant. There is no magic in regeneration. It does not act in the way of a sudden spell. The power of Divine grace employed in effecting that great change, acts in accordance with the laws of our moral nature. The process is not perfected at once. Continued efforts on the part of man, and the continued effusion of Divine influences are necessary to carry forward and to consummate the life begun. There is *progress* in virtue and holiness. We need not, therefore, be surprised, that the Corinthian church should have exhibited, after Paul's departure, various disorders. The irregularities and improprieties that began to prevail may be accounted for in a great degree, by the previous life of the members, and the extraordinary wickedness of the inhabitants generally. Some, unable to resist seductive temptations, relapsed into excesses similar to those which were too common in the world around ; one had even married his step-mother ; others declined in holiness ; while the majority manifested a spirit of dissension arising out of personal preferences for individuals. The gifts which many possessed were abused and made a ground of ostentation. Humility disappeared in consequence. The members were puffed up one against another. In the midst of these disagreeable circumstances, the church wrote to their founder, informing him of their condition, and requesting his opinion on several points. The apostle had also heard from other quarters of the prevailing disorders ; and we may well imagine the great solicitude which such intelligence must have stirred up within him.

In regard to the parties by which the church was distracted, it is impossible to arrive at certain and satisfactory conclusions. Where there is so much uncertainty, there are numerous hypotheses. Nor is it matter of surprise that the topic should have given rise to speculation, when the data furnished by the two

epistles for determining the nature and number of the parties in the church, are so slight and fragile. It is sufficiently obvious, that there were such parties, ranged under different leaders, whose names were employed as symbols of peculiar views; but it is exceedingly difficult to ascertain and to develop the position in which they stood to one another, and the characteristics that marked them out in their associated relations. The epistles contain little more than *an indication* of their existence. Their number and tendencies are obscure and undefined. Hence arises the danger of constructing hypotheses respecting them, not out of materials furnished by revelation, but from our own conceptions. There has been a manifest desire of knowing far more concerning them than what is written—of supplying, by the aid of ingenuity, what the apostle has omitted to record. And yet it is impossible to do justice to the theme, without *endeavouring*, at least, to present something definite in relation to it, although probable conjecture must necessarily be summoned to aid the inquiry. To arrive at certainty is a result that cannot be expected. None need hope to be able to construct such an account as will be tolerably satisfactory without the assistance of slight *presumptions*, or minute probabilities. Where the historical circumstances are so few, it is necessary to carry out their intimations as far as they will consistently warrant. Perhaps hypotheses of too subtle and arbitrary a nature have been already framed in connexion with the Corinthian letters. The peculiar complexion of many minds when turned towards such a topic, may easily lead them beyond the limit of safe speculation, into the region of pure theorising. The tendency of the German mind, in particular, may have originated various accounts of the parties in the Corinthian church, more fanciful in their fullness than most should be inclined to allow. Still, however, the Germans have done good service in this department. They have explored it with wondrous diligence. Instead of shrinking from the tenuous difficulties with which it is beset, they have dived into the region of its shadowy dimness, with all the searching subtleties of which they are pre-eminent masters. But it is likely that they have gone too far. In their intense eagerness to learn much, they have developed much of the fanciful. It is possible to be wise above what is written; but *such* wisdom is available for no practical or useful purpose.

Four parties in the Corinthian church appear to be mentioned in 1 Cor. i. 12.: 'Now this I say, that every one of you saith, I am of Paul; and I of Apollos; and I of Cephas; and I of Christ.' It is also thought that notices of them, more or less distinct, are contained in iii., 4, 22, and in 2 Epist. x. 7.

According to the hypothesis of Eichhorn, the Christ-party

consisted of the *neutrals*—of those who ranged themselves under no human leader, but adhered to the simple doctrine of Christ, following him alone as their master. Pott and Schott adopt the same view. In this way a world of inquiry is saved. Those simple-minded Christians who continued steadfast in their attachment to the apostolic doctrine, looking to the great master from whom it proceeded through the instrumentality of human agents, stand apart, in this way, from the less pure members of the Corinthian church. It is natural that doubts should rest in the minds of many relative to the existence of a distinct party calling themselves *the adherents of Christ*, in a bigoted and exclusive spirit. The apostle certainly mentions the others in the way of censure. But is it not possible, that the expression *οἱ Χριστοῦ* might simply denote those who followed Christ alone and his doctrine as taught by Paul, acknowledging no other master, and keeping themselves at a distance from party-contentions? The terms will bear such an interpretation. It may be supposed that the apostle mentions them along with the others because he could not clearly explain the different factions that had arisen, unless in such a way as to state that some preferred one teacher, others, a different one; while others called themselves simply the followers of Christ. The passage thus exhibits a historical enumeration of the different parties in the church, without implying that all who are characterized in it incurred the apostle's censure. But this view is, as appears to us, untenable. The others mentioned in the verse are noticed, in the way of disapproval; and since the Christ-party is classed along with them, *it* must be involved in the general condemnation. The subsequent words, 'Is Christ divided?' refer equally to all the preceding parties—to the Christ-party as well as the rest—as if *the former* were guilty of attempting to divide Christ. This they could not have been, had they assumed the title in a good sense. They must have claimed the appellation for themselves in a narrow and selfish spirit, as though they alone truly belonged to the Saviour. The form of the expression *μεμέρισται ὁ Χριστός*, derived, as is most probable, from *ἐγὼ δὲ Χριστοῦ*, obviously leads to the conclusion that *all* the preceding factions were exposed to the charge of rending Christ asunder. If the view of Pott be correct, the persons calling themselves *οἱ Χριστοῦ* must have met with the approbation of Paul; and he would not have failed to state his approval even of a few, while censuring the many. The apostle was not prone to censure. He spared the Corinthians as long as he could; and was careful to speak favourably of those who continued steadfast in the pure faith, as he had instructed them. In 1 Cor. iii. 22, 23, on which Pott chiefly rests, there is no reason for believing that the

Christ-party are mentioned or referred to. The writer speaks of *Christians*.

Another hypothesis was proposed by Storr, according to which the Christ-party took for their leader James the apostle, our Lord's brother (Gal. i. 19). In support of it such passages as 1 Cor. ix. 5; xv. 7; 2 Cor. v. 16, are quoted. But it is easy to see, that they afford no countenance to the hypothesis. The brethren of the Lord and James are indeed mentioned in them; but not as leaders of a party in the church. The expression 'to know Christ after the flesh,' does not indicate *family relationship*, but intimacy with Christ in the days of his flesh. It is impossible to account in any satisfactory way for the Christ-party being named after Christ, instead of James their head; and besides, κύριος should have been used, not Χριστός; ἐγὼ εἰμι τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ τοῦ κυρίου, or, οἱ κυρίου in an abbreviated form, would have been the distinguishing appellation. In this case, also, the party of James would have been identical with that of Peter, both consisting of Jewish Christians. Bertholdt slightly modifies the hypothesis, by supposing that this party assumed as their leaders several *brethren of the Lord*, and not James alone; but the conjecture is improbable. We reject the opinion, although adopted by Hug and Heydenreich.

Another hypothesis is that of Baur, who is followed by Billroth. According to it there were, properly speaking, but two parties in the Corinthian church, *the Pauline and the Petrine*. The latter and the Christ-party were substantially the same, although they adopted different names. They were Jewish Christians, whose object was to undermine the apostle Paul by impugning his apostolic authority, and so to engraft Judaism on Christianity. They called themselves οἱ Κηφᾶ, because Peter was the chief among the Jewish apostles. But in order to shew that they were also intimately connected with Christ, through their teachers, they assumed the name οἱ Χριστοῦ, indicating that they were the followers of Christ's genuine apostles, and consequently that they alone were possessed of the genuine gospel. In this way they cast indirect reproach on Paul, as if he was not a true apostle, because he was not called in the same way and at the same time as the others; and also on his adherents, as if they were not the true followers of Christ, because they attached themselves to one who was not a genuine apostle, but corrupted the gospel by views of his own. They singled themselves out from all the other members of the Corinthian church, as though they alone were Christians, in the proper sense of the term. They alone were converted by genuine apostles selected by Christ himself. Thus the Cephas-party and the Christ-party were identical; although the state of affairs at Corinth caused the Judaisers to

keep their legal notions and practices in the back-ground, and to render prominent that aspect of them which combated Paul's authority. But if, as Baur believes, they had not gone so far as to broach their Judaising opinions plainly—if they subordinated their legalising tendencies to the undermining of Paul's apostleship, that they might the more effectually promote their ultimate object, we ask, what was the use of the two appellations? Would not the one have been sufficient? Would not the title *οἱ Κηφᾶ* have been superfluous in that case, not to say injurious to their chief design? For if an *immediate* introduction of their Jewish principles would have probably defeated their object, and therefore they proceeded more cautiously; might not the appellation, *Cephas-party*, have prematurely betrayed their leading purpose in impugning the apostolic authority of Paul? Besides, as Neander remarks, 'by the position of the phrase *οἱ τοῦ Χριστοῦ*, we are led to expect the designation of a party in some way differing from the Petrine, though belonging to the same general division; but, according to this view, the Christ-party would differ from the Petrine only in name, which would be quite contradictory to the relation of this party-name to those that preceded it. Accordingly, this view can only be tenable, if not a merely formal, but a material difference can be found between the last two parties.' If this view be correct, it is very strange that the first epistle should contain no arguments against the Cephas-party. The writer does not defend his apostleship in it. He mentions the divisions in the church in such a way as to censure them, and copiously treats of the various questions which the Corinthians had submitted to him in a letter; but he does not combat the party opposed to himself, who must have chiefly given rise to the disorders by which the church was weakened. In this omission there is something so unaccountable as to suggest strong doubts of the correctness of the hypothesis. Paul's usual mode of combating error was to seize upon it by the roots, to supplant its foundation, and not merely to lop off a few of its externalities. If, then, his opponents in the Corinthian church, who, as secret Judaisers, sought to represent him as no apostle, had caused the agitations within the church, as is most probable, why does he not directly combat them, and defend his apostolic authority. It is improbable that *all* the errors and disorders which the apostle condemns throughout the epistle had no connection with the contention of the parties mentioned in chapter i. 12. If they stood in close relationship to such factions, as we must believe, then is it unaccountable that Paul should not combat the hostile party who employed themselves in the unhallowed work of subverting his true apostleship. Baur himself appeals to no passage in the first

epistle, except to ix, 1, where Paul says of himself, 'Have I not seen Jesus Christ our Lord,' in opposition to those who asserted that he had not seen Him. The proofs of Baur's hypothesis are derived from the second epistle to the Corinthians, particularly the third chapter, verse 16; x. 7, 11, 13, etc; xii. 2. It is unnecessary to examine the peculiar interpretations assigned to these passages, or the peculiar views against which Baur thinks they were directed, since even Billroth acknowledges, that, with one exception, they do not decidedly favour what they have been adduced to support. They have nothing more than *the appearance* of countenancing it; and that too, not to a common reader, but after they have been set forth in the ingenious light which the framer of the hypothesis himself has thrown around them. The only passage which Billroth thinks decidedly favourable, is 2 Cor. x., 7, etc., where he affirms the Christ-party is manifestly intended; but even if it be alluded to in the words, and a comparison of them with xi. 12, instituted, the conclusion that they were *Jewish* errorists cannot be made out. Billroth has attempted to make a slight modification of Baur's view (in relation to the Christ-party) by drawing a kind of distinction between the Petrine and the Christ-party. 'Perhaps,' says he, 'they had assumed the title *Χριστοῦ* at first, in their presumptuous pride. Those of their followers who came nearest to them, and who were most assuming, probably took the same appellation; while others contented themselves with the name *Κηφᾶ* after them (in a manner analogous to the parties of Paul and Apollos), having no other object in so doing than the desire of having for their voucher one who had been really, and by actual personal intercourse with Christ, constituted an apostle. We thus arrive at a distinction (though not a very important one), between the Petrine and the Christ-party, to the necessity of which Neander very carefully draws the attention of his readers, and the omission of which he justly regards as a defect in the theory of Baur. The same individuals did not call themselves at one time of Cephas, and at another of Christ, but each one of those who had been led astray by the false teachers, in speaking of his party, applied to it that name which most suited his own views. It thus appears, that the Petrine division of this party, or that of Peter, strictly so called, was the better disposed of the two.' It is easy to see, that all this is pure conjecture; and that the objections already urged against the hypothesis are not removed. Indeed, it remains *essentially* the same, notwithstanding the modification introduced into it.

The most plausible circumstance in favour of this view is *the position* in which the *οἱ Χριστοῦ* are named, from which it might be inferred that they bore the same relation to the Petrine, as

the Apollos party to the Pauline. In this way there would be no material difference between the last two parties, just as there is no essential distinction between the first two. But the mere connexion of members in the sentence must not be pressed in opposition to stronger considerations. If the Judaisers formed but one party, it is improbable that they assumed more than one name. Besides, the apostle was not intent on the nice adjustment of clauses, such as a logician might be solicitous to present. 'Paul does not,' says Neander, 'as in other cases, form the members of the antithesis merely from the thoughts; but the manner in which he selected his terms was determined by matters of fact.'

Becker supposes, that the Petrine party were strangers who came to Corinth, who on setting up as preachers of the gospel, claimed support from the community, which was refused. Their adherents in the Corinthian church became the Christ-party. There are many considerations adverse to such an hypothesis, which it is unnecessary to mention.

According to Neander, the Christ-party consisted of philosophical Christians who constructed for themselves a peculiar form of Christian doctrine, modelled according to their Grecian subjectivity. They probably belonged to the class of the wisdom-seeking Greeks. These persons professed to adhere to Christ alone, yet with an arrogant self-will which set aside all human instrumentality ordained by God. Olshausen holds the same opinion, but states it more strongly, asserting even that the first epistle was wholly directed against the Christ-party, in whom the essence of the Greek philosophy was concentrated.

The number, however, of philosophic Christians must have been small—too small to form such a party. There is nothing to warrant the idea that the gospel had made converts of many cultivated heathen at Corinth. The wise and the noble had not obeyed its call. The apostle Paul presented it in its naked simplicity, and it was not adapted to arrest the attention of those who boasted of their wisdom.

That the first epistle has a polemic reference throughout to the Christ-party, is an assertion not accordant with the character of it. On the contrary, it has little of a polemic tone and tendency. The greater part of it is didactic, occupied with topics about which Paul had been consulted, although they appear to have been unconnected with the different parties in the church.

The hypothesis of Schenkel which De Wette adopts, is more plausible than any yet proposed, although it is constructed in part of several arbitrary assumptions, and is made to embrace too many particulars. Hence many of Neander's objections to it are not without weight, while others are irrelevant or feeble.

According to it, the distinguishing peculiarity of those calling themselves the adherents of Christ was *mysticism*. They appealed to an inward revelation as Paul appealed to the immediate revelation of Christ to himself, and thus, placing themselves on the same level, assailed his apostolic authority. Such a tendency was highly pernicious, inasmuch as it would soon lead the advocates of it to set aside the reality of Christ's person and work by substituting an ideal person. *The historical* would be forced to give place to the ideal Christ, *the objective* merging into *the subjective*.

In taking a survey of the parties belonging to the Corinthian church, it will perhaps occur, to the careful reader of the epistles, that there is little real ground for believing them to have been so definite or distinctly marked as most German writers suppose. There is not sufficient reason for concluding that they were well defined factions, with wide boundary-lines of doctrine isolating them the one from the other. That there were *broad marks* of separation between them, can scarcely be made out from the epistles themselves. It cannot be shown that they were so peculiarly divided by *doctrinal features*, as has been assumed. That there were distinctions between them in a theological view may be allowed; but that these theological peculiarities were so great as to *characterise* the parties, is a questionable position. Who can tell how far personal attachments and antipathies may have influenced the divisions in question? Who shall affirm how much human passions and prejudices had to do with these unhappy dissensions? Perhaps the latter causes were equally active as the former. In the many attempts which have been made to ascertain the principal features that distinguished the Christ-party, the attention has been directed too exclusively to *doctrinal belief*. Other considerations have not been sufficiently brought forward. An excess of importance has been attached to *the tenets* they are supposed to have held.

After all the investigations which have been instituted, and the various hypotheses that have been framed in regard to the Christ-party, their sentiments will always remain in obscurity. They may have entertained dangerous notions. On the contrary, they may have indulged in speculations comparatively innocuous. Most of their opinions respecting the nature of Christianity may have been curious and unprofitable; or they may have been detrimental to the truth of that holy religion. It is impossible to affirm with certainty one or other of these opposite views. Various errors in doctrine and practice are combated in the epistles: but there is great difficulty in assigning such aberrations to one individual party rather than another.

There are no good data on which the inquirer can proceed in apportioning the incorrect opinions condemned by the apostle to their proper advocates. Some of them may have been entertained by more than one of the parties; while it is possible that others were peculiar to a single faction. They may have belonged to a very few persons, who endeavoured to propagate them in the church; or they may have infected the minds of the majority. The subject is fitted, from its very nature, to give rise to innumerable inquiries; but the means of arriving at a satisfactory result are scarcely at our disposal. One hypothesis after another may be framed with a degree of plausibility; while no real light is thrown on the state of the church at the time when the apostle wrote. The epistles themselves scarcely warrant a definite conclusion. The hints which they afford are too ambiguous to form the groundwork of a well-adjusted theory. They merely excite inquiry without leading it onward to a legitimate termination. Curiosity is awakened, and again painfully repressed.

It is natural to suppose, that such of the Corinthians as had been converted by Paul, were most attached to *his* person. They asserted his apostolic authority, and insisted on his pre-eminence. On the other hand, such as had been converted by Apollos looked up to *him* as *their* apostle, with similar reverence and respect. The idea cannot be entertained that the doctrinal sentiments of the Pauline and Apollos-Christians really differed, since Paul and Apollos preached the same doctrine. The one had planted, the other had watered the church. The Pauline and Apollos-parties therefore were one in creed and in all important particulars. They had received the same lessons; the form and dress in which these lessons were presented varying according to the mental peculiarities of the instructors. Apollos was perhaps the more eloquent; but Paul was the more learned, at least in Jewish literature. It does not appear probable that the two parties contended about the superior wisdom and science attributed to Apollos by the one; for it is difficult to see how Paul could have been justly represented as inferior to Apollos in these qualities. It is true that the writer condemns a false science—a worldly wisdom—but it is unlikely that Apollos would have propounded the gospel in such a way as to mix up with it, either in matter or in form, a science that could be so denominated. The relations in which he stood to Paul were too intimate, and the notices of him are too commendatory, to allow of the supposition that a wisdom stigmatised by the apostle as worldly and false, could have formed a ground for Apollos' preference in the eyes of his adherents. The two parties, therefore, personally attached as they were to their

respective leaders, came into collision about the degree of apostolic authority due to *the founder*, as compared with *the builder up* of the church. Members of the church foolishly disputed which of the two was superior in dignity—which was *the greater* apostle entitled *to the preeminence*.

Thus the Pauline Christians—those who adhered to the doctrines of this great apostle in the Corinthian community—were divided into two parties. One in faith, they chose to designate themselves after two different leaders, respecting whose authority they did not agree. Whatever may have been the mode in which Apollos set forth the doctrines of Christianity, it cannot be inferred that he cast them in a theosophic Alexandrian mould, or presented them in such a dress as a cultivated philosopher of Egypt would naturally do, without attributing to him a culpability for which there is no warrant in the epistles themselves.

The Jewish Christians belonging to the Corinthian church, still entangled with prejudices and national prepossessions, stood in some degree distinct from the Pauline. Their modes of thought were opposed in a certain sense to those which characterised the Pauline and Apollos-parties. They were not able to sympathise in the *free* views of those who had been converted from heathenism. They could not bring themselves to think and act as Christians released from the obligations of the Mosaic law, without considerable difficulty. They felt a lingering attachment to former practices which they were unable at once to eradicate. The difference between them and the Pauline Christians manifested itself mainly in regard to the use of flesh which had been offered in sacrifice to idols; as may be seen in the eighth, ninth, and tenth chapters of the first epistle, where they are called *weak brethren*, and where such as possessed greater knowledge are exhorted not to offend less enlightened consciences by doing things which would cause them to stumble. These Jewish Christians naturally chose Peter for their head; notwithstanding Peter's doctrine in regard to the law did not differ from Paul's. They ranged themselves beneath the banner of the apostle of the circumcision, although there is no probability that he had been personally at Corinth. But they were not actuated by hostile feelings towards Paul. Their creed agreed substantially with his; yet it was restrained from exercising its full power over them. They did not undermine his authority, or call his apostleship in question. But when they saw the other members manifesting their personal preferences by calling themselves the special adherents of Paul and Apollos, they began to look about for an apostle or apostolic man as *their* authority, in order that they, too, might have some distinctive appellation. There is no ground for

believing that they were enemies to Paul's doctrine and person, or that they undermined his apostolic character.

It should be noticed, that they were *Jewish Christians*, not *Judaisers*. They were not teachers, but private members of the church, manifesting no intention of returning to Judaism, or of mixing up the observances of the Mosaic law generally, with the doctrines of Christianity. It is arbitrary to impute to them any such designs as those by which the Judaizing teachers were commonly prompted. They were not persons of the same influence or proselytising activity as the *Judaisers* whom Paul had so frequently to combat. They had passed from the religion of one dispensation to that of another, but were still partially unenlightened as to the genuine freedom of the gospel. Their consciences were greatly offended at the conduct of those Gentile converts who were not sufficiently circumspect or guarded in their actions before their weaker brethren. It is true that their scrupulousness was excessive; but yet, they could not at once lay aside their prejudices. They thought that they were guilty of idolatry if they ate of the food which had been offered to idols, even though they did not know that it had been so used. In this respect their consciences were certainly weak; but yet their more enlightened Gentile brethren should have abstained from doing any thing that might offer violence to conscientious feelings and even to prejudices.

While these three parties were thus divided, they all agreed in acknowledging apostolic authority. But there were others in the same church who disdained to follow or to acknowledge the divinely ordained instrumentality of any apostle. This party looked upon themselves as more enlightened than the rest, and styled themselves after Christ alone. They were particularly opposed to Paul, whose reputation they sought to lessen in various ways. They must be regarded as the most dangerous of all, whatever may have been the complexion of their sentiments.

It is impossible to ascertain what peculiar theological opinions were held by the Christ-party, if it be supposed that they *did* disseminate definite characteristic notions. It is apparent that in both Epistles, especially the second, the apostle refers to persons who questioned his apostleship, and in so doing enters into a lengthened vindication of his own claims. It is probable that the individuals alluded to belonged to the Christ-party. There were also, in the Corinthian church, some who preferred celibacy to married life, attaching a virtue to the former in preference to the latter state. Perhaps the question of marriage was not mixed up with the parties, as though celibacy were a peculiar tenet belonging either to the Pauline or the Christ-party. The disposition to celibacy shewed itself very early in

the Christian church, and it seems unnecessary, in the present instance, to confine it to one particular section of the community at Corinth. Paul, indeed, was unmarried; but it need not thence be assumed that his adherents seized on this feature of his life, and elevated it into general prominence in their doctrinal sentiment.

The fifteenth chapter of the first epistle also shews that *some* (τινὲς) of the Corinthians denied or doubted the resurrection. Whether *they* should be assigned to the Christ-party, is matter of uncertainty. Rather do they seem not to have belonged to it; although Neander, Olshausen, and Jäger, assume that they did so; while Meyer, on the other hand, imagines that they pertained to the Apollos-party. The manner in which they are introduced (τινὲς ἐν ὑμῖν λέγουσι) shows that the error in question had not yet taken deep root, or developed itself so extensively as to be maintained by a whole party. Besides, the words of the apostle relative to the persons who speculated about the mode of the resurrection, seem to imply that the error had not spread widely, because he employs mild language, and abstains from severe reproof.

Let us now look at the conduct and principles of those who set themselves in opposition to the apostle, for by them alone can the Christ-party be discovered. It was after Apollos's departure, that certain persons of Jewish descent came to Corinth, furnished with letters of recommendation, probably from some part of Asia Minor, who set themselves forward as apostles, and commenced building on Paul's foundation. But their spirit and aims were different from those of the disinterested labourer into whose field they intruded. Puffed up with notions of their own importance, they used the appliance of a worldly wisdom in preaching the gospel, surrounding the simple story of the Saviour's teachings and death with the garb of human philosophy and eloquence. In consequence of the undue stress which they laid upon *their science*, the contrast between them and Paul became all the more apparent. *He* had insisted on the great fact that Christ died for sinners, without employing the aids of learning or the artificial ornaments of rhetoric. *He* had determined not to know anything among them, save Jesus Christ and him crucified. Hence *they* began to lessen the apostle in the eyes of the Corinthians, on account of his pretended deficiency in the very qualifications in which *they* boasted, and to inspire their followers with a pride similar to that which they themselves exhibited. *They* were the men who possessed a high degree of wisdom which raised them far above the ordinary apostles. In consequence of their conduct in impugning his apostleship, and teaching others to disobey his precepts, they

are deservedly branded as 'false apostles, deceitful workers,' who transformed themselves into the apostles of Christ. Most of the allusions to them are found in the second epistle. Perhaps they had become more open and determined in their proceedings in the interval between the first and second letters.

Now it is to the adherents of these false apostles that we should probably look for the Christ-party. The errors that appeared in the church at Colosse, and which are traceable to a Jewish source, may serve to show that the wisdom of which the teachers boasted was allied to Alexandrian theosophy. They were spiritualizing or Gnostic Christians, who pretended to have attained a deep insight into the mysteries of revelation. Schenkel, followed by De Wette, conjectures, that they pretended to stand in an intimate connection with Christ by *visions* and *revelations*. They gave out that they enjoyed a mysterious and immediate communion with Jesus, such as Paul himself never had. In this manner he supposes that the appellation by which they were distinguished is best accounted for. Accordingly Paul reluctantly introduces visions and revelations, relating how he was caught up into Paradise and heard wondrous things. Perhaps it is unnecessary to resort to this conjecture. The passages in which the apostle of the Gentiles dwells upon the historic Christ and Him crucified, as the essence of the gospel, those which affirm that he *saw* the Lord, and such as speak of extraordinary revelations communicated to him, may have been introduced simply to vindicate his apostleship, to uphold his official character so unjustly depreciated, and to show how he relied on the simple presentation of the great fact that Christ died for sinners. It is not very probable that the distinguishing peculiarity of those calling themselves the adherents of Christ was the *mystical*. Perhaps, they did appeal to an inward revelation as Paul appealed to the immediate revelation of Christ to himself, and thus placed themselves on the same level to assail his apostolic authority. That the prevailing tendency of their belief was to set aside the reality of Christ's person and work by substituting an ideal person can hardly be allowed. It is pure conjecture of an improbable kind to affirm, that their creed forced the *historical* to give way to the *ideal* Christ, the *objective* merging into the *subjective*. We assume that the Christ-party was composed of such as had listened to the false teachers who had come to Corinth, that they exalted human wisdom and human eloquence, laid claim to a deeper *γνώσις* by which they were specially united to Christ, and moulded Christianity into a theosophic, spiritualizing form, endangering thereby its simplicity, essence, and beauty. Following the example of their instructors, the adherents of these selfish

errorists had become inflated with self-conceit, and depreciated Paul, as though he were no apostle. They rejected, indeed, the authority of *all* the apostles. They scorned to be considered the adherents of any man; and named themselves accordingly, after Christ himself, as if they were more closely related to him than their brethren. Their great bane was the science and philosophy of the world, inspiring them with extravagant notions of spiritual freedom.

In addition to the four parties in the church, there were various disorders, as has been already intimated. We shall particularize and consider them separately, in the same manner as has been followed with regard to the topic just treated.

2. Some of the converts had fallen into sins of uncleanness, in consequence of the prevailing immorality around them. Various individuals in the church had yielded more or less to lasciviousness. Lewdness in different forms seems even to have become general, as may be inferred from the words *ὅλως ἀκούεται ἐν ὑμῖν πορνεία* (v. 1.), where *ὅλως* must be referred not to *πορνεία* exclusively, or to *ἀκούεται* alone, but to the whole clause, intimating that varieties of uncleanness, included in the generic term *πορνεία*, were common among the Corinthians. This conclusion is confirmed, if not by chapter x. 8, at least by 2 Cor. xii. 21. *Πορνεία* does not here signify a *case* of fornication first stated generally and then more definitely noticed in the terms *καὶ τοιαύτη πορνεία*. The apostle speaks of the intelligence he had received that lewdness commonly prevailed among them, and proceeds to notice an extreme case of it, viz. unnatural intercourse between a step-son and step-mother. Notwithstanding the scandalous nature of the deed, it would appear that the members of the church had not withdrawn from intercourse with the incestuous person. The writer, after expressing his astonishment that they had allowed the man to remain in connexion with them, enjoins his immediate exclusion from the church. At the same time he takes advantage of the opportunity to speak of other vicious persons, the covetous, the idolater, the railer, the drunkard, the extortioner, who were to be dealt with in a similar manner. He exhorts them to hold no intercourse with the fornicator, or those guilty of notorious vices, to disavow their doings entirely, lest Christians should seem to countenance their sins, and so disfigure the purity of religion in the eyes of the heathen. At the same time he wishes his readers not to understand him as saying that he meant to exclude them from all communication with wicked men not belonging to the church, for that were impossible. He refers only to the vicious *in the church*. They are enjoined to expel from their society incestuous and immoral characters, to

keep no company with them, lest infection should pervade the whole body, and they themselves should be encouraged in a course contrary to the genius of Christianity.

3. Another impropriety into which the Corinthian Christians fell, was that of their appealing to heathen tribunals. They had lost the primitive spirit which distinguished the earliest adherents of Christianity. Hence they disputed about property. They were not of one heart and one soul. They had not all things in common. Brotherly love had become cold. Mutual distrust had taken possession of their minds. A generous confidence in the honesty and fidelity of their brethren had given place to selfishness and envy. It was customary among the Jews to decide their disputes by men chosen from among themselves, a practice which they founded on Exodus xxi. 1; and, in the opinion of some, it was transferred from the synagogue to the Christian church. Christ, however, gave no express command on the subject, and therefore Paul could appeal to none. In order to correct such unseemly conduct, he reasons with them in another manner: 'if the saints are destined to judge the world and angels themselves, they are much more competent to decide the small affairs of the present life.' He informs them that they should not go to law with one another on any occasion, much less appeal to heathen tribunals. All legal disputes between Christians are censured, as contrary to the love they ought to cherish towards one another. How absurd was the course which these Gentile Christians pursued in this matter, when the dignity and future elevation of the believer are considered. And what a low standard of moral excellence did the Corinthian church present, notwithstanding the multitude of spiritual gifts possessed by the members.

4. In their observance of the Lord's supper, the Corinthians had committed various abuses. In order to bring the institution as near as possible to the form in which it was observed by Christ, a feast or evening meal preceded the supper among the Corinthians, just as the paschal feast preceded the Last Supper properly so called. Both were considered as *one* solemn transaction in commemoration of the Redeemer's death, and designated by the *one* appellation *δεῖπνον κυριακόν*. At the preparatory meal, or *agape*, all the members assembled, and partook on an equal footing, without distinction of age, sex, or rank; to show that *all* the brethren stood in the same relation to their common Master, and to evidence their mutual love. Each according to his circumstances brought meat and drink with him, to be shared in common by all. The poor man partook of the bounty of the rich, as if he had contributed his share of the meal; and the brethren rich and poor, masters and slaves, in one holy fellow-

ship, exhibited a beautiful spectacle of unity to the world. Such were the *agapæ*, or love-feasts, of these early Christians—meals preceding the symbolic ordinance specifically styled the Lord's Supper. But when Christian love declined, these *agapæ* lost their true character and object. They ceased to be meals of which all the members partook alike and indiscriminately. Those who brought food with them ate and drank by themselves, apart from the members who had been prevented by poverty from contributing. In consequence of this distinction, the poor in their hunger were compelled to look on; while their rich brethren, having more than was necessary, sometimes indulged in excess. The one was hungry, and the other was drunken. The meal degenerated into a private feast, losing all its significance and beautiful propriety. Better had it been to eat and drink in their own houses, than thus to despise the church of God, and to put to shame such as had no houses of their own, when the poor saw their wealthy brethren revelling in abundance, without being invited or allowed to partake. By that conduct the rich rendered themselves unfit to join in the essential and more solemn part of the ordinance, with reverence and spiritual discernment. These irregularities and excesses the apostle strongly censures. In many countries there existed an ancient custom of holding general entertainments, to which each family brought its own contribution, and where each family also consumed its own quota apart, without sharing in the viands of the rest. In this manner the *agapæ* were conducted, although the spirit of the institution was so different. From whatever source the Gentile Christians borrowed their love-feasts, similar meals do not appear to have prevailed in other apostolic churches. They did not therefore constitute an essential or necessary part of the Last Supper. The Corinthians associated the meal with the solemn ordinance instituted by Christ to commemorate his death; and the apostle did not forbid it. He wrote against its abuse, without condemning it altogether; because there was something in the custom appropriate to the occasion.

5. Some of the Corinthians doubted or denied the truth of the resurrection. It is difficult to ascertain the precise form which their scepticism assumed, or the connexion in which it stood to other and kindred doctrines. They do not appear to have denied the fact of Christ's resurrection; neither is it necessary to assume that they rejected the immortality of the soul; for although the reasoning of the apostle asserts these truths as well as the resurrection of the body, he may have adduced them, not because they were rejected, but because he would show that they were inseparably connected with the tenet impugned. It is agreeable to Paul's mode of developing doctrines and refuting

opponents, to point out the necessary bearings and consequences which the denial of an important truth must have on other parts of the Christian system. It is not probable that such doubts sprang from *Sadduceeism*, as Michaelis and others supposed; or from *Essenism*, as Mosheim conjectured. According to either view, the impugnors of the resurrection belonged to the Jewish party in the Corinthian church. The manner in which the apostle combats the error, is not such as he would have employed against these Jewish sects. Rather do the doubts in question seem to have sprung up in Gentile soil, and to have been entertained by Gentile Christians. But it cannot well be maintained that they were the product of Epicurean philosophy, since Epicureanism presents a marked opposition to Christianity in almost all its features. It has no points of contact by which it could be united in part or whole, with the principles of the gospel. Besides, the epicurean maxims of life referred to in chapter xv. 32—34, are represented as *the consequence* not *the source* of the particular scepticism combated by Paul. A denial of the resurrection and immortality is set forth as *naturally leading to* a course of life practically godless, and sinful in all its manifestations. Neander and others suppose, that the impugnors of the doctrine in question were cultivated Gentile Christians—men who had exhibited a philosophic tendency before conversion. It may be doubted, however, whether there were many belonging to that class in the Corinthian church. *Very few* of the Grecian philosophers had turned to the new religion. Those who had received a philosophical training, stood aloof from the simple preaching of the cross. Hence Olshausen thinks, that these deniers of the resurrection were *allegorists*, such as Hymeneus and Philetus, who taught that the resurrection was past already, setting aside *the historic reality* of the doctrine by a spiritualising process. But the apostle's argumentation does not suit these doubters. His polemics are too mild in relation to such dangerous and daring sceptics. To whatever class the persons under consideration belonged, they speculated about the resurrection in a manner which led to a denial of the fact, probably because they could not see how a body which has mouldered away into corruption could be raised again from the dust; or how a material structure, such as it is in the present state, could be intimately associated with the soul in a higher condition of being.

In refuting their notions, the apostle begins with the fact of Christ's resurrection as a cardinal point in the gospel. Having proved *its* reality, he assumes it as the basis of his reasoning. He grounds the fact of the general resurrection on it. After shewing that there will be a resurrection of the dead, he adverts

to the *how* of the question, and lessens the difficulty by stating that the resurrection-body will be a *spiritual* body, different from the *natural* body of the present life.

Paul seems to have *heard* of the preceding improprieties, without perhaps being consulted about them by the Corinthians in their letter. Let us now advert to other topics, regarding which he had been *asked* for instruction.

1. The subject of marriage was one that gave rise to perplexity in the Corinthian church. Hence Paul's opinion of it was sought. It is not easy, however, to discover *the precise point* to which the question of the Corinthians referred; or the particulars respecting which they were unable to come to a definite conclusion; because the writer touches upon several things in the seventh chapter. In the first place, he speaks of marriage generally, and enjoins the married state on all, as one tending to prevent fornication. On this account the parties joined in wedlock should not defraud one another in respect to the obligations of the married state. At the same time, he expresses his preference of a single life in the case of those for whom such a life was safe. In the next place, he condemns separations and divorces, even though one of the parties was a heathen, as long as the unbelieving party chose to continue with the other. After a short digression, the apostle turns to the unmarried, recommending them to remain single because of impending calamities; and lastly, he touches upon the second marriage of women, but so cursorily as to intimate that it had not been included among the interrogatories addressed to him. *The ascetic spirit* had manifested itself among the Corinthians, leading some of them to argue for celibacy, as though it were not only preferable to marriage, but had a peculiar virtue in itself. An extreme view was taken of the single life as essential to Christian perfection, or at least as far superior in every instance to the married state. Here, then, was the particular point of inquiry—Was celibacy in all cases to be recommended as preferable to a wedded life? It is *possible* that the inquiry extended to the subject of separation between married parties, especially when one of them was an unbeliever; because Paul treats of this also in his answer; but it is not *certain*. It need not be supposed that the apostle confined himself to the single thing about which he was specially consulted. Rather should we expect from him a comprehensive view of the question in its collateral aspects and bearings. Celibacy, and the absolute preference due to it, is *the great*, perhaps *the only point* of which his opinion was asked.

It is difficult to discover the party from which this ascetic propensity proceeded. It is improbable that it originated with

the *Jewish* Christians, because in the eyes of the Jews, marriage was a most honourable and blessed institution, while celibacy was reckoned a disgrace. Neander appears to think that it took its rise with the Pauline Christians, who overvalued celibacy because their leader was unmarried. This is improbable. The adherents of Paul in after times never insist on a single life. Olshausen again traces it to the Christ-party, whose *idealistic propensities* as developed by the Gnostics, accorded with the erroneous tenet. All this is mere conjecture without the shadow of a basis. Perhaps the ascetic disposition which manifested itself very early in the churches, was not confined to the adherents of one party among the Corinthians. It may have been adopted even by some Jewish converts who borrowed it from the Gentile Christians. It depended in a great degree on the temperament of individuals.

When treating of the marriage relation, the apostle lays down a general maxim deserving of particular notice from the important applications of which it is capable. In whatever situation or position conversion found an individual, it did not command him to start away abruptly from the externalities of former associations and pursuits. Christianity did not interfere with the relations of his outward life. They remained unaffected by its reception. The existing order of society was externally undisturbed by the new religion of the Redeemer. Such were the wisdom and moderation of its principles, that their tendency was to introduce outward reforms gradually and surely, apart from premature and revolutionary measures. This is applied by Paul to the case of slaves. The institute of slavery entered extensively into all the relations of the ancient world. Society in its manifold connexions was pervaded by its influence. Hence it comes under the notice of the New Testament writers, especially as many slaves were converted to Christianity and incorporated into newly-formed churches. It is obvious that the principle on which it is founded, is expressly condemned by *the spirit of the Christian religion*. It cannot be sanctioned by a system which enforces the comprehensive rule, 'Do unto others, as you would wish to be done to by them.' Had the attempt been made to introduce compulsory servitude as a new thing, in the time of our Lord and his apostles, it would have been denounced and resisted as a measure of unmitigated evil. But it was then an old system. It had taken root and grown up as one of the prevailing vices which characterised the ages antecedent to the Lord's advent. Accordingly the apostles did not enjoin masters to set their slaves at liberty. By moulding the dispositions of the masters, Christianity prepared them to be kind and benevolent, and to regard such as were placed under them in the light of

brethren. In like manner the latter are exhorted to submit cheerfully and patiently to the yoke, recollecting the true freedom conferred on them, and consoling themselves with the assurance that inward and spiritual liberty raises them far above the boasters of mere outward freedom. Yet Paul does not undervalue civil liberty, although it was not the direct object of the religion which he inculcated to interfere with civil arrangements. On the contrary, he exhorts every slave to avail himself of a legitimate opportunity to obtain his emancipation. He prefers freedom to slavery when it could be procured without doing violence to the principles of justice, or the established relations of social life. From this it is sufficiently apparent, that the apostle looked upon slavery as uncongenial with the genuine spirit of Christianity. He anticipated the time when it should be done away by the regenerating influence of that new religion which was destined to effect an entire revolution in the state of society. Since all of us are ransomed by the blood of Christ, it does not become our proper dignity to be the compulsory servants of human beings like ourselves.

The second question relates to the duties of Christians, respecting the eating of flesh previously offered to idols. Some of the Gentile converts, presuming on their freedom under the gospel, not only ate without scruple the meat that was sold in the market, after it had been dedicated to idols, but went so far as to partake of the feasts held in heathen temples where such flesh was set before the guests. This gave offence to the Jewish Christians, whose weak consciences naturally revolted at the conduct in question. There are three points of the subject which the writer takes up, as if there had been three questions put to him concerning it.

(a) Should a Christian eat the flesh of an animal offered in sacrifice to idols, after that flesh has been exposed in the market for sale and purchased as food?

(b) Should a Christian accept the invitation of a friend to partake of a feast held in a heathen temple, and eat the flesh there presented?

(c) Should a Christian go to a private entertainment and partake of the flesh of animals that has been dedicated to idols?

To the first the apostle replies in the affirmative. One might lawfully partake of meats offered to idols if he were established in knowledge and faith, being fully convinced that idols are nothing. The apostle, however, proposes some limitation to the exercise of Christian freedom in this respect. Care must be taken that in so doing, a weaker brother shall

not be offended; for an action perfectly harmless in itself, ceases to be a matter of indifference when the doing of it offers violence to the feelings or prejudices of a tender, over-scrupulous conscience.

To the second, the writer replies in the negative, because every Christian who is present at the idol feasts, makes himself virtually a partaker of the idolatrous worship, and is so far a heathen. 'Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of devils: ye cannot be partakers of the Lord's table, and of the table of devils.'

In regard to the third particular, the apostle states, that every Christian might be present without scruple, at a private entertainment given by a heathen, and eat whatever should be set before him, without asking any questions about the origin of the food provided. But if any scrupulous guest should say, when a particular dish was brought forward; 'this meat has been offered in sacrifice to an idol,' the Christian is exhorted, in that case, to abstain from the food, not on account of his own conscience, but out of regard to the conscience of the other.

We do not intimate our belief, that the inquiry addressed to the apostle, assumed the preceding form, or that it alluded to the various points embraced in the reply, for the writer was accustomed to look at subjects connected with Christianity in a comprehensive aspect, without being confined to the exact point brought under his notice.

This topic was intimately connected with the relation between the Pauline and Petrine parties. The former, boasting of their freedom of knowledge, and entertaining correct conceptions of the Christian's privileges, *applied* their principles improperly. They joined, without scruple, in festive entertainments, where the flesh left after the sacrifices was presented; and looked upon the uneasiness of the Jewish Christians as a narrow-minded prejudice deserving of ridicule. Thus the great law of love was forgotten in its modifying influence on the social relations. Extravagant ideas of their advancement in knowledge and faith, engendered pride and presumption. An overweening estimate of themselves turned away their attention from others whom they should have also regarded. The Petrine Christians, on the other hand, allowed their minds to be harassed with anxiety, where there was no ground for it. Their scruples of conscience rendered them timid and feeble. They were entangled with unnecessary and slavish prejudices. How wisely and admirably does the apostle deal with the question, when he lays down the doctrine regarding it, that the believer, in the case of practices innocent in themselves, is bound by the law of love to act in such a manner as to promote the conversion

of souls, the spiritual prosperity of those who are not so enlightened as himself, and the glory of God. Thus particular circumstances affect things in themselves indifferent.

3. Another subject referred to the apostle, was the demeanour of females in the public meetings. In consequence of a misunderstanding of Christian liberty, females appeared unveiled among a congregation of worshippers composed of both sexes. This practice had been adopted in imitation of the men, who appeared with uncovered heads according to the Grecian custom. A false liberalism had induced them to overstep the bounds of propriety in asserting their privileges under the new religion. The gospel, it is true, broke down the slavish restraints imposed upon the sex in heathen countries, restoring woman to her rightful elevation and dignity. But some had been led to make an improper application of their freedom, as if it placed them upon a perfect equality with the other sex; for they appeared unveiled in the public assemblies, and undertook to pray and to prophesy, assuming the office of teachers. Accordingly the apostle condemns the custom of removing the veil in the promiscuous meetings of the worshippers, as well as that of praying and prophesying in public; although he reserves his denunciation of the latter practice to a subsequent occasion (xiii. 34). He reminds the women of their subordination to the men, and shews the true position which each occupies relatively to the other and to Christ. He deems it improper that woman should appear in the bold openness proper to man, representing the uncovering of her head in the assemblies as unsuited to her modesty and *subordinate* position. The *tendency* of the custom is indicated to be immoral. Some think that Paul also denounces the opposite practice in the men of the Corinthian church, viz. that of keeping the head covered in the public assemblies; but there is no good ground for concluding that the males had fallen into this unseemly habit.

4. The Corinthian church seems to have had a large measure of spiritual gifts. All the forms and manifestations of miraculous power enjoyed by the early Christians appeared in lively action within that society. Powerful excitement was produced among them by the wonderful operation of the Spirit on their susceptible minds. They had great zeal for the cultivation of the spiritual gifts pertaining to public and oral instruction. But these divine impulses were diverted from their legitimate scope by the infirmities of the persons on whom they were bestowed. From deficiency of mature holiness in their possessors, such tokens of inspiration were affected by unworthy motives and desires which were often allowed to obtain undue ascendancy. The remains of depravity did not permit the supernaturally

elevated powers to put forth their exercise in an *orderly* and *edifying* exhibition. It is singular that those on whom the ability of speaking in foreign languages was conferred, should have been permitted to pervert it by making a shew of it to their own exaltation. And it is still more inexplicable, that the power should have been *continued* to the men who habitually misapplied it. The *application* of the charismata bestowed on the Corinthians gave rise to numerous abuses. The more striking and dazzling were over-valued, particularly the gift of tongues; because the manifestations of that gift were adapted to fill the people with wonder. Those who possessed it looked down upon others not equally favoured with themselves; while the latter envied the former.

In order to correct this improper use of charismata, and at the same time to point out their right use and object, the apostle enters minutely into a consideration of the subject. It is obvious that speaking in other languages and prophesying were the gifts which he intended especially to notice, inasmuch as these related to *public* speaking, and were therefore most valued. But he treats of the character, value, and object, of spiritual gifts *generally*, for the sake of shewing the proper relation which the gift of tongues bears to other kindred manifestations of supernatural influence. Here he introduces a metaphor taken from the human body, to prove that as all the members form one united organism, none superfluous, none contemptible; so also the different gifts of the Spirit constitute one spiritual organism, each working harmoniously for the good of the whole. After this, he describes the manner in which love should regulate all the gifts, because from it they receive their true value. In the last place, he comes to the main part of the subject, viz., the use of two gifts in the public assemblies—viz. speaking in foreign languages and prophesying. The latter, as tending to the edifying of the church, is preferred to the former.

Eichhorn supposes, that the letter sent by the Corinthians to Paul did not mention the present topic. But we have followed Billroth and De Wette, who think that the apostle's counsel had been asked on this point as well as others. The expressions in which it is introduced intimate that he had been consulted: 'now concerning spiritual gifts, brethren, I would not have you ignorant.' (comp. x. 1.)

5. The last question of the Corinthian church related to the collection for the poor saints at Jerusalem. Respecting the mode of collecting and conveying this contribution, the writer gives some directions.

Art. II—*Antonio Perez and Philip II.* By M. Mignet, member of the Institute of France, Perpetual Secretary of the Academy of Moral and Political Sciences, and translated, with the approbation of the author, by C. Cocks, B.L., Professor of the living Languages in the Royal Colleges of France. London: Longman, and Co.

M. MIGNET, like M. Thiers, entered the literary career, twenty years ago, as historian of the French revolution, and, in July, 1830, was, with his competitor and friend, launched into political existence as a councillor of state. The history of the French revolution by M. Mignet, though much shorter than that of M. Thiers, is greatly superior; and exhibited the young author as a more acute observer, a more laborious investigator of events and of their causes, a more faithful adherent to truth, and a more sincere advocate of the great principles, the establishment of which, as the basis of government, was the object of the revolution. In Thiers's history, a miserable compilation, written under the inspiration of the ex-terrorists of 1793 and 1794, and of the ex-censors and *head-spies* of the imperial police, who had amalgamated in the *Constitutionnel*, every one easily discovers the contempt for truth, the barefaced corruption and base servility, which the historian afterwards displayed as a statesman. M. Mignet's work, on the contrary, evinced an earnestness of principles and opinions, and a dignity of character, which completely unfitted him for acting a principal part under the present government. This explains why, with so many physical and mental advantages over the 'monkey' of M. Lammenais, M. Mignet is nothing more, at the present time, than he was in August, 1830—a councillor of state, and *archiviste* of the ministry for foreign affairs; whilst the other has been—in turn, minister of almost every state department.

M. Mignet has no cause to regret the comparative obscurity to which he has sentenced himself; and we are sure that he finds, in his literary pursuits, a gratification much more enviable than that resulting from the enjoyment of ministerial power. Let him persist in his laborious studies, and profit of the opportunity which his present situation offers, to prepare a conscientious and true history of the Consulate, of the Empire, and of the Restoration, which are still wanting, notwithstanding the pretensions of Thiers. This it is which we expect and claim from M. Mignet, instead of his contributions to the heavy, stupid *Journal des Savants*, the fit burial-ground for the philosophical nonsense of Cousin and the historical falsehoods of the doctrinaires.

Let not our readers, however, suppose that in these last observations we intend to throw blame on the subject of the book before us, or on its composition. Far from it. We unhesitatingly declare, that we never met in the *Journal des Savants*, with anything equal to the articles now collected in this volume; that we approve of their exhumation by the author, for real publication; and that Messrs. Longman are entitled to the gratitude of the public, for this translation, which is the best we have seen of any French book.

Although, apparently or purposely, written to elucidate some few historical points, the matter is handled in such a manner as to give to the elucidation all the interest that could be found in a novel; and people of fashion who read nothing but for pleasure, may take this volume without fear of being disappointed. This, however, if it were its only or its principal merit, would not have induced us to recommend it. Our praise even would be much restricted, if, to the advantage of being an entertaining book, it added no other than that of being at the same time an erudite book; but there is something more in it than mere erudition and style. It evinces a moral purpose, which, we have no doubt, the author had in view, when he determined to exhibit, in the middle of the nineteenth century, some of the events which marked the end of the sixteenth. People well acquainted with the present state of France cannot help thinking, on reading this volume, that, in most parts, it is an allusion to the political characters who, to the disgrace of the country, are now eminent in France. It is apparent, that the picture of the wily successor of the great Emperor and King, Charles V., bears a great likeness to the *Napoleon of Peace* and that in the delineation of the characters of the ministers of Philip II., the author had in view some of the ministers of Louis Philippe. We all recognise Antonio Perez.

The theories of Italian policy which were, by the way, but too conformable to the practice usually followed, had given him a perversity of mind which his own disposition had not over well withstood. Being of a quick understanding, an insinuating character, and a devotedness which knew neither bounds nor scruples, full of expedients, a nervous and elegant writer, and expeditious in business, he had gained the favour of Philip II., who had gradually given him almost his entire confidence. By his agreeable manners he tempered and disguised much of the disgust which people felt at the king's shallow and sordid parsimony. Philip imparted to him his most secret designs, initiated him into his private thoughts. Such high favour had intoxicated him. He affected even towards the Duke of Alva, (qy. Dalmatic?) when they met in the king's apartments, a

silence and a haughtiness which revealed at once the arrogance of enmity and the infatuation of fortune. So little moderation in prosperity, coupled with the most luxurious habits, a passion for gaming, a craving appetite for pleasures and excessive expenses, which reduced him to receive from every hand, excited against him both envy and animosity in the austere and factious court of Philip II., and, on the first opportunity, inevitably prepared his downfall. This event, too, he himself hastened, by serving too well the distrustful passions of Philip, and, perhaps, even by exciting them beyond measure against two men of his own party, Don Juan of Austria, (the king's brother,) and his secretary Escovedo. (pp. 11 and 12.)

The primordial fact is the assassination of Escovedo, by order of the King. What part did Perez take in the perpetration of that murder? Was he the mere instrument of the suspicious policy of Philip, or did he advise him to rid himself of this secretary, the confidant and agent of his brother? If he urged him by his counsels to this extremity, was he guided by reasons of state, or by private interest? Did he not persuade him to get rid of Escovedo, because the latter exalted the ambitious imagination of Don Juan, and entertained him with dangerous projects? or, did he make use of this pretence, by deceiving Philip, to rid himself of a man who constrained and blamed his amours with the Princess of Eboly, the widow of Ruy Gomez de Silva, whose creatures they both were? Have these amours any foundation; and did they, as has always been believed, cause a rivalry between the king and the minister? Ought the disgrace of Perez, managed with skilful dissimulation, and pursued with implacable rigour, to be attributed to the policy of Philip, who sacrificed Perez, bearing the whole responsibility of the murder of Escovedo? or, ought we also to seek its cause in the vindictive jealousy of the prince, who showed himself inexorable, as soon as he knew that Perez had deceived him? Such are the questions examined and solved in M. Mignet's work.

The trial of Perez, in Madrid; the torture inflicted on him, to obtain the avowal of his treachery; his escape from his dungeon, through the devotedness of his wife; his appeal to the sovereign tribunal of Arragon, where he had taken refuge; the interference of the Inquisition, to take possession of his person, and to deliver him back to the vengeance of Philip; the supreme tribunal yielding to the commands of the inquisitors; Perez saved by a popular insurrection, at the very moment when he was given up to be led to the prison of the Inquisition, and succeeding in escaping into France; Philip sending an army into Arragon, chastising the Arragonese with his customary

cruelty, and abolishing their constitutional *fueros*;—finally, the long exile of Perez, passed in a multitude of political intrigues, and his death;—such are the events which are related, with praiseworthy accuracy, and in a most instructive manner.

-
- Art. III.—1. *The Expedition to Borneo of H. M. S. Dido, for the Suppression of Piracy*: with Extracts from the Journal of James Brooke, Esq., of Sarawak, now Agent for the British Government in Borneo. By Capt. the Hon. Henry Keppel, R. N. In two Volumes, 8vo. London: Chapman and Hall, 1846.
2. *Trade and Travel in the Far East*; or, Recollections of one-and-twenty years passed in Java, Singapore, Australia, and China. By G. H. Davidson. 12mo. London: Madden and Malcolm, 1846.
3. *Enterprise in Tropical Australia*. By G. Windsor Earl, M. R. A. S., Linguist to the North Australian Expedition, and Commissioner of Crown Lands for Port Essington. 12mo. London: Madden and Malcolm, 1846.

Our knowledge of the vast region distinguished by the general name of the Indian Archipelago, dates from a period as recent as the discovery of America. To the enterprise of the early Portuguese navigators, and of their successors in maritime discovery and colonization, the Dutch, we were long indebted for an acquaintance with the largest groupe of islands on the globe, occupied by an aboriginal race so different from the other families of nations, in physical type and language, as to form a distinct class of the human species in physiology. Upon this aboriginal population, in times comparatively modern, has been grafted the Malayan stock, imparting, to a great extent, their peculiar character and higher civilization to the Polynesian tribes with whom they have intermingled. The various islands differ, indeed, very remarkably, in their climate, productions, and social condition. The whole Archipelago is situated within the tropics, the equinoctial line running nearly through its centre; but their geographical position, geological formation, and varying fertility combine to produce a very marked diversity; and Mr. Crawford, to whom we are indebted for the best general account of this region, points out five natural divisions. In the very centre, partaking in its vast extent of the climate and character of three of these divisions, lies Borneo, the largest island,

if we exclude from that description the Australian continent, in the world; being about nine hundred miles in its extreme length, and seven hundred and twenty miles across at its greatest breadth. A high chain of mountains intersecting it longitudinally, accounts for the diversity of the climate of its eastern and western portions. About two-thirds of the western portion resemble, in physical character, productions, and civilization, the islands which form the western boundary of the Archipelago, together with the Malayan Peninsula; that is to say, Sumatra, Java, Bali, and Lombok, sometimes included under the general name of the Sunda Islands. The whole eastern coast of Borneo, up to about the parallel of 3° N., classes with the large island of Celebes, and the chain of smaller ones between the meridians of 116° and 124° E. The north-eastern angle of Borneo comes within the same natural division as the island of Mindanawi, or Mindanao, and the Sooloo groupe, in which the clove and the nutmeg are indigenous, but of inferior quality. To the north of these, the groupe of the Philippines, lying within the region of hurricanes, forms a distinct and peculiar division. In the opposite direction, between the parallels of 2° N. and 10° S., and extending eastward to longitude 130° E., lie the Molucca and Spice Islands, the strange productions of which, both in the animal and the vegetable kingdoms, are not indigenous to any other parts of the globe.

The Portuguese had extended their maritime conquests and commerce to the Indian Archipelago a century before any other European nation followed in their wake. Diego Lopez de Sequeira, the commander of a royal squadron of four ships, first reached Sumatra and Malacca in 1507; ten years after Vasco de Gama had doubled the Cape. In 1511, Albuquerque, the viceroy of the Indies, effected the conquest of Malacca; and, in the same year, he despatched a squadron to the Moluccas, which touched at Amboyna only, and returned with a cargo of spices. Ten years afterwards, a Portuguese squadron was sent to take possession of the Spice Islands in the name of the King of Portugal; and the commander, by a combination of perfidy and violence which characterized the whole course of the proceedings of the Portuguese in those seas, succeeded in establishing himself in the island of Ternate. Europe, Mr. Crawford remarks, gained no advantage from the discoveries of the Portuguese in the Indian seas. 'By their wars in the Moluccas, the production of spices was diminished, the ancient carriers of the trade were plundered, and the Persian Gulf and Red Sea, the avenues by which the commodities of India reached Europe, were either seized or blockaded by them. The consequence of all this was, that the commodities of India were sold dearer than

before the discovery of the new route. The industry of Europe received no new impulse, for no new market was created for her commodities.*

De Britto, the Portuguese commander of the squadron sent to take possession of the Moluccas, met there, to his astonishment, the companions of Magellan, who had reached them from the eastward in the course of the first voyage round the world. The great navigator himself had been killed in an affray with the natives of one of the Philippines. One of his two ships had been forced back into the Moluccas, in distress. De Britto seized it, and sent the crew prisoners to Portugal. In 1526, the Spaniards made their first attempt to establish themselves in the Moluccas; but, three years afterwards, they consented to renounce their claim for a pecuniary consideration of 350,000 ducats. In 1565, the Spaniards took nominal possession of the Philippine Islands; some years however elapsed before they had established themselves by the conquest of Manilla.

In 1578, nearly seventy years after the discovery of the maritime route, the English, under Sir Francis Drake, first made their appearance in the Indian Archipelago. Drake touched at Java and Ternate, and was followed by Thomas Cavendish, who, in his circumnavigation of the globe, touched at Java in passing through the strait between that island and Bali. In 1596, the first Dutch expedition to the Indies reached Java, where the new adventurers soon embroiled themselves with the natives, and became involved in hostilities with the Spaniards. In 1611, just a century after the establishment of the Portuguese authority at Malacca, the first Dutch governor-general laid the foundation of the future capital at Jacatra. The most flourishing period of their commercial greatness in these seas, was from 1629 to 1675.

Meantime, the English had, in 1603, opened a commerce with Acheen and Bantam; and within fifteen years from their first appearance in the seas of the Archipelago, they had established factories at Patani in the Malayan peninsula, at Acheen, Ticoa, and Jambi in Sumatra, at Bantam and Jacatra in Java, at Sakadana and Banjar-massing in Borneo, in the Banda Isles, at Macassar in Celebes, in Siam, and in Japan. The British settlement at Bencoolen in Sumatra, was established in 1685, and removed to Fort Marlborough in 1714. In 1763, it was erected into an independent presidency; and it was not till 1802, that it was annexed, by act of Parliament, to the presidency of Bengal.† In 1825, it was transferred to the Dutch in

* Crawford's Indian Archipelago, v. iii. p. 216.

† 'The transfer of this settlement to the Dutch, in exchange for Malacca, in 1825,' says Mr. Davidson, 'was a severe blow and great

exchange for Malacca. The first English settlement on Pulo Penang, to which was given the absurd name of Prince of Wales Island, dates from 1785. Malacca was captured by the British in 1795. In 1811, Java, Celebes, and the other Dutch possessions were surrendered by capitulation on the part of the French governor-general, to the British authorities. The British government of Java, under the enlightened administration of Sir Stamford Raffles, lasted only from 1813 to 1816, when, by an act of the most ignorant impolicy, the finest island in the world, in which the commercial, fiscal, and judicial reforms introduced by the British governor were just beginning to exert the most beneficial effort, was abandoned to its old oppressors, the Dutch, together with Malacca, Celebes, and the Spice Islands; and but for the spirited and patriotic conduct of Sir Stamford Raffles, our traders would have been altogether excluded from the Indian Seas.

The very first art of the Dutch, on regaining possession of Java and its dependencies, was, to impose restrictions upon British commerce; this they were enabled to enforce, by having the command of the straits of Sunda and Malacca, which form the western entrance to the Chinese and Java seas; and it at length became evident, that, unless some strong and decisive steps were taken, to which the British Government shewed an unaccountable reluctance, nothing but actual force could obtain for our traders ingress to the thousand isles of the Archipelago. With some difficulty, after having for a long time maintained, single-handed, a contest with the Dutch Colonial authorities on one part, and with those of the East India Company on the other, Sir Stamford Raffles obtained, in a personal interview with the Marquess of Hastings, the sanction of the Bengal

disappointment to all the natives, both high and low. At a meeting of chiefs held at the Government House, at which the English and Dutch authorities were both present, for the purpose of completing the transfer, the Senior Rajah rose to address the assembly, and spoke to the following effect:—‘Against this transfer of my country I protest. Who is there possessed of authority to hand me and my countrymen, like so many cattle, over to the Dutch, or to any other power? If the English are tired of us, let them go away; but I deny their right to hand us over to the Dutch. When the English first came here, they asked for and got a piece of land to build warehouses and dwelling-houses upon. That piece of land is still defined by its original stone wall, and is all they (the English) ever got from us. We were never conquered; and I now tell the English and Dutch gentlemen here assembled, that, had I the power, as I have the will, I would resist this transfer to the knife. I am, however, a poor man, have no soldiers to cope with yours, and must submit. God’s will be done.’ The speaker was an old man, with whose power and will for mischief in former days, the British had good cause to be acquainted.’—*Trade and Travel*, pp. 81, 2.

Government to the splendid enterprise of hoisting the British flag at Singapore. In his own words, he wanted neither people nor territory: all he asked was, permission to anchor a line of battle-ship at the mouth either of the straits of Sunda or of those of Malacca, and the trade of England would be secured, the monopoly of the Dutch broken. Thither, accordingly, he proceeded in person, in the discharge of his delicate commission, and, in spite of the protest and opposition of the Government of Penang and the exclusive pretensions of the Dutch authorities, hoisted the British flag, on the 20th of February, 1819, on the island which, he had penetration enough to see, might become in the East, 'that Malta is in the West.' Still, he had reason to fear that the Home Government, directed by the evil genius of the Castlereagh-Bathurst policy, might a second time destroy all the results of his patriotic exertions, and be 'weak enough to sacrifice him, honour, and the Eastern Archipelago to the outrageous pretensions of the Dutch.' For some time, the British Government, in complaisance, deferred to their remonstrances so far as to decline having any thing to do with Singapore, throwing the whole responsibility upon Sir Stamford; and it was not till the settlement had been established for three years, that Singapore was recognized by Great Britain. Meantime, within the first two years and a half after its establishment, no fewer than 2889 vessels had entered and cleared from its port, of which, 383 were owned and commanded by Europeans, and 2506 by natives, their aggregate tonnage amounting to 161,000 tons. Such was the result of the bold step of declaring Singapore a free port, open to ships and vessels of every nation, free of duty; in which, Sir Stamford shewed himself to be far in advance of the narrow commercial policy that had hitherto governed our Eastern affairs.

Until within the last three years, the trade of Singapore has gone on increasing, its harbour being visited regularly by native vessels from all the neighbouring islands, as well as from the Indian Continent. Mr. Davidson gives his reason for thinking, that its trade has now reached its *maximum*. The recent establishment of the British Colony of Hong-Kong, and the opening of the Northern ports on the coast of China, will tend, he fears, to lessen the Chinese-junk trade. On the other hand, the merchants of Singapore are themselves embarking with spirit in the China trade; and even if the settlement should not advance in prosperity at the same rapid rate that has hitherto marked its progress, its advantageous position, delightful and salubrious climate, picturesque beauty, and fertile soil, must always render it at once a valuable possession and the emporium of a considerable trade. Its present aggregate im-

ports and exports are estimated by Mr. Davidson at three millions sterling; and its revenue is more than sufficient to pay its expenses.

It has been in consequence of the decrease of its trade with China, that the merchants of Singapore, and their connexions in Java, have been led to turn their attention to the aggressions made by the Dutch on our commerce with the ports of the Archipelago, and to transmit to the Home Government those urgent appeals which have at length had the effect of directing attention to one of the fairest fields of British mercantile enterprise. In no quarter have our commercial interests suffered so much from deplorable and unaccountable neglect. 'Pirates,' remarks Mr. Earl (in 1837), 'have been allowed to swarm in the immediate neighbourhood of the only settlement which we possess in these seas; and a rival European power has been suffered to commit aggressions on our commerce with impunity; so that, had not the strong desire to obtain British manufactures, displayed by the natives themselves, induced them to overcome the obstacles which have been thrown in their way, an intercourse with the Eastern islands must, ere this, have totally ceased.' How long this disgraceful state of things might have been suffered to continue, so far as the British Government is concerned, it is impossible to say; but the whole merit of awaking the slumbering spirit of philanthropy with regard to these islands, of leading the way to new fields of commercial enterprise, and of overcoming every political obstacle to the carrying out of Sir Stamford Raffles's views over the whole Archipelago, is due to the extraordinary individual whose romantic adventures are detailed in the 'Expedition to Borneo.'

Before we proceed to give an account of what Mr. Brooke has accomplished, it may be a suitable introduction, to advert to the sagacious views expressed by Sir Stamford Raffles, in a letter to Lord Minto, with regard to the importance of a settlement in Borneo, so far back as 1811, and to the valuable information comprised in that letter, respecting the political condition and relations of the several groupes of islands. It does not appear that any of them, taken separately, can pretend to the rank of a powerful or independent state. At no very distant date, the sovereign of Menangkabu, the ancient capital of Sumatra, was acknowledged over the whole of that large island; and its influence extended to many of the neighbouring islands. The respect still paid to its princes by all ranks, Sir Stamford Raffles speaks of as amounting almost to veneration. Borneo, or, as the natives call it, Pulo Kalamantan, appears, on the other hand, to have been, from the earliest times, divided into three distinct kingdoms. That of Borneo (Bruni) properly so called, included the

whole northern part of the island, from Cape Datu, in latitude $3^{\circ} 15'$ N. to Kanukungan Point, in the Straits of Macassar, $1^{\circ} 15'$. The kingdom of Sakadana extended from Cape Datu to Cape Sambar; and the remainder of the island, from Cape Sambar to Kanukungan Point, to that of Banjar-massing. The kingdom of Sakadana was ceded by the rajah of Bantam to the Dutch East India Company; and they had, at one time, the military possession of that of Banjar-massing, their sovereignty actually or virtually extending over the whole island, except Borneo Proper. Sakadana, once the most celebrated city in Borneo, and a great emporium, was destroyed by the Dutch, at the suggestion of the rajah or sultan of Pontiana, almost the only native chieftain in the island whose power has been created, and is still supported, by commerce. His capital is situated in latitude 4° N. The present representative of the sultans of Sakadana is the independent rajah of Matan; one of the most valuable districts of Borneo.

Sir Stamford Raffles enumerates the various groupes of states as under:

1. The states of the Malayan Peninsula.
2. The states of the Island of Sumatra.
3. The states of the Island of Borneo.
4. The states of the Sunda Isles, extending from the straits of Sunda to Timor and Celebes.
5. The states of Java.
6. The states of Celebes.
7. The states of Sooloo and Mindanawi.
8. The states of the Moluccas, comprehending Ceram and Banda.
9. The states of Jelolo, or Little Celebes.
10. The Black Papua states of New Guinea and the Papua Islands.

Borneo, Celebes, Sooloo, the Moluccas, and the islands of the straits of Sunda and Banka, compose what has been denominated the Malayan groupe; and the Malays dwelling on the shores of these and other islands, may with certainty be classed as belonging to the same race. 'In ancient times,' says Sir Stamford Raffles, 'the Malay chiefs, though possessing the title of sultan or rajah, and in full possession of authority within their own domains, yet all held of a superior or suzerain, who was king of the ancient and powerful state of Majopahit, on the island of Java, and who had the title of *Bitara*. Malacca was one of the first states that shook off this allegiance, and became, in the end, so powerful, as to hold a great part of the Malayan peninsula and of the opposite coast of Sumatra, in a similar dependence, although the sovereigns of these states still retained

their titles, and exercised their independent authority within their own dominions.*

Malacca itself was founded by a Malayan colony from Sumatra, previously to the introduction of Mohammedism in the thirteenth century; and according to Mr. Crawford, the country of Menangkabu, in Sumatra, is, beyond dispute, the parent country of the Malay race. Previously to their adopting the Mohammedan faith, the religion and civilization of the Malayan tribes were Hindoo. As we advance eastward, the traces both of the earlier Hindoo, and of the later Mohammedan civilization become less marked. In the island of Celebes, that of Hindooism appears to have made very small progress; and it was not till the close of the sixteenth century, that the religion of Mohammed was generally adopted there. Everything concurs to shew, that the civilization of the Indian archipelago has proceeded from the west; although there is equally strong reason to conclude that its islands were originally peopled from the opposite direction. The interior is uniformly found inhabited by various tribes differing from the Malays and from each other, and exhibiting different gradations of early civilization, the greater part of whom are pagans. Sir Stamford Raffles describes the two great tribes into which the more civilized portion of the inhabitants of Celebes are divided—the Macassars and the Bugis,† as the most bold, adventurous, and enterprising of all the eastern nations, and extremely addicted to a military life. ‘They are equally celebrated for their fidelity and their courage, and for this reason, they have long been employed, as the Swiss in Europe, not only in the armies of Siam, Kambodia, and other countries, but also as the guards of their princes. They can be recruited with facility, and easily submit to military discipline.’ The same remark applies, with nearly equal force, to the inhabitants of Jelolo or Halamahera, situated between the Moluccas and the Papua islands. The Sooloos, who inhabit the groupe to the north of Borneo, between that island and the Philippines, are described as a bold and enterprising race, ‘of the mixed Malay and Philippine breed.’ They have had frequent wars with the Spaniards of Manilla, and have never acknowledged their authority. They have generally adopted the religion of Islam, and, though active and enter-

* Memoir of Sir Stamford Raffles, vol. i. p. 78.

† About the period of the first arrival of Europeans in the East, the Macassar and Bugis tribes were among the principal dealers in spices; and the island of Celebes was nearly under the authority of a single sovereign. On the breaking down of this great empire, several smaller states rose from its ruins.

prising, are extremely vicious, treacherous, and sanguinary. Sir Stamford Raffles estimates the inhabitants of the Sooloo islands, in their most flourishing state, at not more than sixty thousand souls, or, including their dependencies, at about one hundred thousand. Between eighty and ninety years ago, they were much devoted to commerce; and about the period of the first British settlement in the island of Balambangan, off the coast of Borneo, we had for some time a commercial resident in Sooloo; but the government being too weak to afford any efficient protection, he was withdrawn; and the breaking down of the government has covered the Sooloo seas with fleets of formidable pirates.

The great island of Mindanawi, between the Moluccas and the Philippines, is the original country of the Lanuns, the most formidable of all the Eastern pirates. Its northern coast is under a precarious subjection to the Spaniards; but the great Lanun bight is occupied by a number of small chieftains, who have, from time immemorial, been addicted to piracy. The most powerful state on the island is that of Mindanawi, the sultan of which is a Mohammedan, although the great mass of his subjects are pagans, in almost every respect similar to the Dyaks or aboriginal inhabitants of Borneo.

Numerous and various are the tribes of the Eastern isles which have not embraced the religion of Islam to this day; they are consequently reckoned infidels; and cruises against the infidels are sure to receive the approbation of all the Arab teachers settled in the Malay countries. Hence, piracy has always been regarded by them as an honourable occupation; and the Malay romances and traditions constantly refer to piratical achievements. From considerations of policy, and in conformity to instructions from home, the Dutch colonists, as well as the Portuguese, have promoted the profession of Christianity among the eastern islands. Several small islands in the Malayan archipelago, according to Sir Stamford Raffles, are inhabited almost entirely by 'Christians of the Catholic persuasion;' as the islands of Sanggir and Siauk, between Jelolo and Mindanawi. In many other islands, 'the Protestant persuasion has made considerable progress; and, in the flourishing times of the Batavian regency, teachers were dispersed over all the low chain of islands which extend from Bali and Lambok, to the great island of Timor.' The islands in which the Christian faith has been most extensively diffused, according to the same authority, are, the great island Ende or Manggerai, the isles of Solor, Salerang, Lomblim, and Ombai, the great island Timor, and the several small islands in its vicinity, as Savo, Roti, and Samba.

'Amboyna, Kissa, and Rotti,' says Mr. Earl, 'are the head-quarters of Christianity in the Indian Archipelago; and as the natives are an intelligent people, I look upon them as being likely to prove highly useful to any future settlement on the northern coasts of Australia. They acquire the English language with considerable facility, and many are sufficiently educated to read and write Malayan in the Roman character.'—*Earl's 'Enterprise,' &c.*, p. 122.

In many of these islands, the natives, having no written character of their own, have been instructed in the Roman character, and taught to read Malay and other dialects in it. Various religious formularies have been printed for their use; and translations have been executed for the use of these Christians in some of their languages, which have little or no affinity to the Malay. Mr. Crawford remarks, that 'the Christian religion, as a prevailing worship, can be said to exist only in the Spice islands and the Philippines. In the latter, the converted natives are *nominally* catholics, and, in the former, *nominally* protestants.' 'Both the Portuguese and the Dutch supported schools in the Moluccas for religious instruction; and an allowance of rice was given to the students, which appears to have been the great inducement to frequent them; whence the Dutch often ludicrously denominate the native converts, '*rice Christians*.'† Yet, to even this nominal and mongrel Christianity, a beneficial influence is ascribed. 'The natives of Amboyna who are Christians,' says Crawford, 'are much superior, both in morals and in intelligence, to their countrymen who are Mohammedans: and, notwithstanding all the oppression they have endured, are a peaceable and inoffensive race of men. In the Dutch armies, they ranked above all the other Asiatic troops, and were paid, equipped, and considered on this scale of merit.' The natives of the Philippines also, who have embraced the Romish superstition, are described as possessing a share of energy and intelligence superior not only to that of their Pagan and Mohammedan countrymen, but also to that of all the western inhabitants of the Archipelago,—to that of the very people who, at a former period, bestowed upon them laws, language, and civilization. 'In the inter-colonial navigation of all the nations of Europe in the Indies, the natives of Manilla are almost universally employed as gunners and steersmen; that is, in those offices in which it is necessary to combine skill and firmness with mere physical labour and agility.' In this case, however, it may be suspected, that physical causes of superiority have combined with the influence of Christian civilization; and

* Crawford's 'Ind. Archipelago,' vol. ii. p. 274.

that there has taken place a considerable intermixture of races.*

The Philippine Islands, and a portion of the coast of Mindanawi (or Mindanao), are the only possessions of Spain in the Archipelago; and the Portuguese retain only part of the great island of Timor and the eastern extremity of that of Flores. The southern portion of Timor, and the adjacent islands, the Moluccas, the Carimon Isles, Java, Banca, and portions of Sumatra, Borneo, and Celebes, belong to the Dutch. They have, also, very recently taken possession of the Island of Bali. The British have hitherto had no settlement or harbour between Port Essington, on the northern coast of the Australian Continent, and Singapore; nor, previously to Mr. Brooke's establishing himself on the coast of Borneo, between Singapore and Hong-Kong.

By the treaty between Great Britain and the Netherlands 'respecting territory and commerce in the East Indies,' signed at London in March 1824, mutual freedom of trade is guaranteed, *with the exception of the Molucca Islands*, and especially Amboyna, Banda, Ternate, and their immediate dependencies, including Ceram; the Moluccas being defined to be, that cluster which has Celebes to the westward, New Guinea to the eastward, and Timor to the southward; these three islands *not* being included in the exception. His Britannic Majesty engaged, however, in that treaty, that no British settlement should be formed on the island of Sumatra, nor any treaty concluded by British authority with any native prince, chief, or state therein. Also, that no British establishment should be made on the Carimon Isles, or on the islands of Battam, Bintang, Lingin, or any of the islands *south* of the straits of Singapore, nor any treaty concluded by British authority with the chiefs of those islands. Borneo is not referred to in the treaty; nor was it necessary: of course it follows the rule of Celebes, in *not* being excepted.

The vast importance of this magnificent island had not escaped the comprehensive mind of Sir Stamford Raffles, who commences the letter to Lord Minto, already referred to, with adverting to it as one of the most fertile countries in the world, as well as one of the most productive in gold and diamonds. The camphor which it produces, is the finest in the world; and it is thought, that it is capable of growing every species of

* Mr. Earl remarks, that the mixed descendants of the Dutch at Macassar, in Celebes, 'are an enterprising race, possessing the commercial spirit of their Asiatic forefathers, guided by the superior intelligence of the European.'—p. 123.

spice. The interior has never been explored by Europeans; and this ignorance of the actual state of the country, it is remarked, is probably one of the principal causes that no European settlement has hitherto proved advantageous, but has generally been abandoned after a short trial. The following observations, though made five and thirty years ago, have lost none of their interest and importance.

‘The only exception to this observation (the speedy abandonment of the settlements) is the Dutch settlement of Banjar Massing, which continued from 1747 to nearly three years ago, when it was abandoned by Marshal Daendals to the Rajah, by agreement, for the sum of fifty thousand dollars. The Rajah soon after sent an embassy to the government of Penang, *inviting the English to settle in their place*; but, this application not being attended to, *they applied to me*, on my coming down to Malacca last December. During the continuance of the Dutch settlement at Banjar Massing, the expense and revenue were always supposed to be very equally balanced; and the abandonment of the settlement was strongly opposed by many of the Dutch.

‘The only other territory to which the Dutch have any claim on the Island of Borneo, is the coast from Sacadana to Mampawa; Pontiana, which lies about twelve miles up the river; and Landa, which lies about seventy miles up the river of that name, navigable by large boats. This territory, they acquired in virtue of a cession from the Sultan of Bantam in 1778; they destroyed Sacadana, and established factories at Pontiana and Mampawa, which they abandoned as unproductive after a trial of fourteen years.

‘No other part of the island of Borneo has been settled by Europeans. The English, in 1772, intended to establish a factory at Passir, but abandoned the design on some commotions taking place in that state. Its object was, to make Passir a depot for opium and Indian piece goods, and for the contraband trade in spices. In 1774, a short time after the first settling of Balambangan, Mr. Jesse was deputed as Resident to Borneo Proper, with which state he concluded a treaty, by which the settlement of Balambangan acquired the exclusive trade in pepper; *stipulating, in return, to protect Borneo from the piratical incursions of the Sulu and Mindanawi men*. Neither of the parties, however, fulfilled their agreements, though the Residency at Borneo was continued for some years after the first breaking up of the Balambangan settlement in 1775. On the north-east of Borneo Proper lies a very considerable territory, the sovereignty of which has long been claimed by the Sulu government, and a very considerable part of which, together with the islands of the coast, has been for upwards of forty years regularly ceded to the English by the Sulus, and has, also, at different periods been occupied by the English, without any objection on the part of the government of Borneo Proper. This ceded district, which extends from the river Kiomanis on the north-west, which forms the boundary of Borneo Proper, to the great bay of Towsan Abia on the north-east

is undoubtedly a rich and fertile country, though in a rude and uncultivated state; and it is admirably situated for commerce, though the different failures of Balambangan may seem to indicate the contrary. . . . From the inquiries which I have taken every opportunity of making respecting the island of Borneo, I feel perfectly satisfied that no settlement is likely to succeed in that quarter, which is founded on a commercial, instead of a territorial basis. We have already acquired territorial rights; and the only question seems to be, whether these can be turned to advantage, either by cultivation or by commerce. To this I should have no hesitation whatever in answering, yes; finding the Dayak, or original inhabitants of Borneo, not only industrious in their habits, but particularly devoted to agriculture, and so manageable that a handful of Malays have, in numerous places, reduced many thousands of them to the condition of peaceful cultivators of the ground. Indeed, nothing seems wanting to effect this on a great scale, but a strong government, which can afford efficient protection to property and safety to individuals; and in the case of the Dayak, I regard it as an advantage that they have not hitherto adopted the religion of Islam, and would be ready, from the first, to regard us as their friends and protectors. Another great advantage which attends the formation of settlements in Borneo, is, that there are no territorial claims upon it from any European nation but ourselves.'—*Memoir of Sir Stamford Raffles*, vol. i. pp. 54—58.

The accomplished writer did not survive long enough to see his enlightened suggestions realized; but, like seed sown on the waters, they have at length, after many days, fructified. The spirit of philanthropy which glowed in his bosom, has communicated itself to one who seems in a very special and extraordinary manner fitted and destined to execute his benevolent plan.

James Brooke, the only surviving son of the late Thomas Brooke, Esq., of the East India Company's civil service, was born, April 29, 1803. He went out to India as a cadet, and distinguished himself by his gallantry in the Burmese war, during which he was shot through the body in an action with the Burmese. Having received the thanks of the Government, he obtained leave to return to England for the recovery of his prostrated strength. He resumed his station, but, shortly afterwards, relinquished the service; and, in 1830, left Calcutta for China in search of health and amusement. In this voyage, he saw for the first time the islands of the Asiatic Archipelago, and was struck with their vast importance and picturesque beauty. He inquired, and read, and became convinced, that Borneo and the Eastern Isles afforded an open field for enterprise.

'To carry to the Malay races, so long the terror of the European merchant vessel, the blessings of civilization; to suppress piracy,

and extirpate the slave-trade, became his humane and generous objects ; and from that hour, the energies of his powerful mind were devoted to this one pursuit. Often foiled, often disappointed, with a perseverance and enthusiasm which defied all obstacles, he was not till 1838 enabled to set sail from England on his darling project. The intervening years had been devoted to preparation and inquiry. A year spent in the Mediterranean had tested his vessel, the *Royalist*, and his crew ; and so completely had he studied his subject, and calculated on contingencies, that the least sanguine of his friends felt, as he left the shore, hazardous and unusual as the enterprise seemed to be, that he had omitted nothing to ensure a successful issue. 'I go,' said he, 'to awake the spirit of slumbering philanthropy with regard to those islands ; to carry Sir Stamford Raffles's views in Java over the whole Archipelago. Fortune and life I give freely ; and if I fail in the attempt, I shall not have lived wholly in vain.'—*Expedition to Borneo*, vol. i. pp. 3, 4.

The prospectus of the undertaking was published in the *Geographical Journal* (vol. viii. part 3), in 1838, when Mr. Brooke's preparations for sea were nearly complete. In his own journal, he expresses his firm conviction of its beneficial tendency, 'in adding to knowledge, increasing trade, and spreading *Christianity*.' On the 27th of October, the *Royalist*, a schooner of one hundred and forty-two tons, with a picked crew of twenty men, left the river, and, after a succession of heavy gales, quitted the land on the 16th of December. They touched at Rio, and at the Cape, where they were detained a fortnight ; and at length, on the 1st of June, reached Singapore. Various causes delayed their sailing again till the 27th of July ; and on the 1st of August, the *Royalist* anchored off the coast of Borneo, the *pirate coast* ; for that part has been the harbour for pirates of every description. It had been represented, moreover, as abounding in shoals and reefs, perilous to the navigator. The bay between Points Api and Datu was found, however, free from danger ; and nothing could be more majestic than the scenery,—the bay lined with a feathery row of beautiful casuarinas, behind these a tangled jungle, backed by a mountain some two thousand feet in height. On Sunday, August 4th, Mr. Brooke 'performed divine service ;' and it is curious enough to find one who had braved danger in every shape, in field and on flood, taking credit to himself for 'manfully overcoming the horror which he has to the sound of his own voice before an audience.' After spending some days in examining the coast, and taking observations, the *Royalist* entered the Sarawak river, which discharges itself at the eastern corner of the bay ; and on the 15th, anchored abreast of the 'town of that name, the residence of the Rajah Muda Hassim, about twenty miles up the river. It is

described as a collection of mud huts, erected on piles : the residences of the Rajah and his fourteen brothers occupied the greater part, and the majority of the population, amounting to about fifteen hundred persons, consisted of their followers. The strangers were extremely well received ; and permission was readily obtained from the Rajah, to make excursions into the country, but with the intimation that, if they went too far up the rivers, he could not be answerable for their safety, owing to the disturbed state of the interior. The extracts given from Mr. Brooke's journal describe the exploratory trips made up several rivers, which brought him in contact with the Dyak tribes, of whom he gives a very favourable account. In one of these excursions, an interesting discovery was made,—the wild nutmeg-tree in full flower, growing to the height of between twenty and thirty feet ; the nutmegs lying in plenty under the trees. ' While the East Indian Company were sending Captain Forest from their settlement of Balambangan as far as New Guinea in search of this plant, how little they dreamed of its flourishing so near them in the island of Borneo ! ' Mr. Brooke spent about ten weeks in this his first visit to the island of Borneo ; and the information he collected was both interesting and satisfactory, so that he left the coast for Singapore ' with an excellent prospect for the coming year.'

Mr. Brooke's next trip was, attended by a Bugis native, to the island of Celebes ; and an entertaining account is given of an excursion into the hill-region of the district of Bonthian, which presented the perfection of woodland, combined with the picturesque characteristics of mountain scenery. The party reached the summit of Lumpu Balong, ' never before reached by European.' The Dutch officers stated, that three successive Residents of Bonthian had attempted it, and failed. The chief production of the country is coffee, which is grown in great quantities on the hills, and exported by the Bugis merchants. On his return to Singapore, Mr. Brooke was detained for several months by ill health ; but he availed himself of the opportunity to re-copper and re-fit the *Royalist* ; and by the end of August 1840, he again found himself at Sarawak. There, with some reluctance, he was induced to offer his aid to the Rajah in suppressing a rebellion ; and he succeeded in bringing the affair to a happy issue by the submission of the insurgents, after a protracted warfare, of which the ludicrous is quite as prominent a feature as the horrible. On his return to Sarawak, he had an opportunity of making the acquaintance of a band of pirates from the island of Gilolo, who came to pay their respects to the Rajah. He returned to Singapore in February 1841, his principal object being to procure a vessel to trade be-

tween that place and Sarawak; and early in April, he sailed with a schooner of ninety tons, laden with a suitable cargo, in company with the Royalist, for the seat of his future government;—for the Rajah had made him an offer, which Mr. Brooke had accepted, of the lordship of the Sarawak territory, in return for his services in the war, and upon his engaging to bring down trade to the place. We must pass over the narrative (taken from Mr. Brooke's journal) of the vexatious delays and trying difficulties by which his patience, courage, and strength of purpose were put to a severe test. At issue with the well-meaning, but weak-minded Rajah, beset by intrigues, and surrounded with a fierce and lawless people, Mr. Brooke had the singular courage to despatch both his vessels; one to Borneo, on a mission of humanity, to inquire respecting the fate of the crew of an English vessel, reported to have been shipwrecked, the other to Singapore with a cargo; thus placing himself, with only three companions, at the mercy of circumstances, 'relying on the over-ruling Providence in which he trusted, to bring him safely through all his difficulties and perils.' When, at length, on the 24th of September 1841, the Rajah signed the agreement by which Mr. Brooke became the governor of Sarawak, he had still to contend against a secret conspiracy; while the state of his little dominion, ravaged by war, and torn by dissension, presented difficulties which seem at times almost to have overwhelmed him. His reflections upon commencing a new year (Jan. 1, 1842), though not intended, we presume, for the public eye, are so characteristic that we shall transcribe them.

'This is a year which to me must be eventful; for, at its close, I shall be able to judge whether I can maintain myself against all the circumstances and difficulties which beset me, or whether I must retreat, broken in fortune, to some retirement in my native land. I look with calmness on the alternative; and God knows, no selfish motives weigh on me; and if I fail, my chief regret will be for the natives of this unhappy country. . . . If the sum of human misery can be alleviated—if these suffering people can be raised in the scale of civilization and happiness,—it is a cause in which I could suffer; it is a cause in which I *have* suffered and *do* suffer: hemmed in, beset, anxious, perplexed, and the good intent marred by false agents, surrounded by weakness, treachery, falsehood, and folly, is suffering enough; and to feel myself on the threshold of success, and only withheld by the want of adequate means, increases this suffering.'—Vol. i. pp. 261, 2.

Six months having elapsed, we find him writing in a more cheerful strain.

‘The internal state of the country is decidedly improving and flourishing, and bears the aspect of gradually increasing prosperity. Justice has been strictly administered. Robberies, which, a few months ago, were of nightly occurrence, are now rarely heard of; and that vile intriguing to make poor people slaves, from debt or false claims, is entirely stopped. . . . So far, indeed, nothing can be better than our internal state; there is peace, there is plenty; the poor are not harassed; and justice is done to all. The Dyaks of the interior are improving and content, and gaining courage daily to complain of any wrong that may be offered them.’—Vol. i. p.p. 295, 6.

In July, Mr. Brooke proceeded in person to Bruni, the capital of Borneo Proper, for the purpose of accomplishing three important objects; to effect a reconciliation between the Sultan and his uncle Muda Hassim, in order to pave the way for the return of the latter to Borneo; to obtain the Sultan’s approval and ratification of his own instalment in the government of Sarawak; and to procure the release of the *Kleeses* (Hindoostances) of two shipwrecked vessels. The first object was gained at once; the third was also readily conceded; and on the 1st of August, 1842, in pursuance of a resolution adopted in a conclave of *Pangerans* (Malay nobles), the second was consummated by the signing and sealing of the contract constituting him Rajah of the country of Sarawak. The year 1843 opened under favourable auspices; and in February, Mr. Brooke deemed the affairs of his government in so safe and prosperous a state as to allow of his paying a visit to Singapore. There he met with Captain the Hon. Henry Keppel, who had been ordered by the British Admiral to proceed with his vessel, the *Dido*, to the Straits, with a view to the protection of trade, and the suppression of piracy. Mr. Brooke gladly availed himself of the offer made him to return to Sarawak in the *Dido*, in the following May; and the appearance of this ship of war, the largest the natives had yet seen, anchored almost in the centre of their town, struck awe into the Rajah himself, and was regarded by Mr. Brooke as the consummation of his enterprise. ‘The *Dido* was the first square-rigged vessel that had ever entered those waters.’

Captain Keppel’s object in visiting Borneo, was, to attack the pirates in their strong-holds; and he commenced with an expedition against those of the Sarebus river. The details of this ‘the grandest expedition that had ever been known in the annals of Malayan history,’ are narrated by the gallant Captain in a *naïve* and spirited style; and, to many readers, the description of this novel warfare will be the most entertaining portion of the work. The destruction of their strongly fortified places

astonished the whole country. In June, the *Dido* was recalled to China; but, in July of the following year, Captain Keppel, having been ordered to return to the straits, found letters at Singapore from Mr. Brooke, which determined him to proceed at once to Borneo, with the *Dido* and *Phlegethon*, and resume operations against the pirates, by whom Sarawak itself was threatened. On the 5th of August, 1844, the expedition proceeded against the Sakarran pirates, whose strong-holds were in like manner destroyed; and this was followed up with a second blow, by which the province was cleared of the worst pirates upon this part of the coast. In September, having achieved this important service, Captain Keppel sailed for Singapore, where he found orders for England. On his return home, he 'had the gratification to learn that Mr. Brooke had been appointed agent for the British Government in Borneo, and that Captain Bethune had been despatched on a special service to that island;' events which he could not but consider as 'of great importance to the best interests of humanity, and to the extension of British commerce throughout the Malayan Archipelago.'

The sequel is supplied from Mr. Brooke's own journal. Captain Bethune, and an enterprising friend of Mr. Brooke's, to whom he acknowledges himself greatly indebted for his present position and success, arrived at Sarawak in Her Majesty's steamer *Driver*, on the 18th of February, 1845. They brought a letter from Lord Aberdeen, notifying to Mr. Brooke his appointment, and directing him to proceed to Borneo with a letter addressed to the Sultan and the Rajah Muda Hassim. Captain Bethune was, moreover, commissioned to report on the best locality for a settlement or station on the north-west coast. Mr. Brooke and 'the letter' were received at Borneo with due honours. The Sultan was profuse in his kind expressions, and inquired of the interpreter when the English would come to Labuan; adding, 'I want to have the Europeans near me.' Labuan was examined and found to present many advantages as a refuge for shipwrecked vessels, and a windward port relative to China, and as affording abundance of coal for steamers. In the latter respect, and in point of salubrity, it is very superior to the abandoned station of Balambangan to the northward. From Mr. Brooke's brief notes we gather, that he returned to Singapore in the *Driver*, and, towards the end of May, came back to Borneo; that, after a short stay, he again visited Singapore and Malacca; and on the 8th of August, found himself anchored off Borneo Proper with seven vessels, an eighth being hourly expected. The British Admiral, Sir Thomas Cochrane, had come in person to demand reparation of the Sultan and Rajah for the detention and confinement of two British subjects sub-

sequently to their agreement with our Government. They threw the blame of the outrage upon Pangeran Usop, whom they were unable to control or punish. As this worthy proved contumacious, he was dealt with accordingly; his house was speedily rendered tenantless, but the delinquent escaped by flight. The treaty was thus enforced, and our supremacy maintained. The fleet then proceeded to Malludu bay, notorious as a harbour of pirates; and on the 19th of August was fought 'the celebrated battle of Malludu.' The piratical seriff and his followers made a desperate resistance, and some valuable lives were lost on the side of the victors; but this strong-hold was completely destroyed. Mr. Brooke returned to Bruni on the 31st, and early in September found himself once more *at home* at Sarawak. And the last notice in the journal, after referring to a five days excursion among the Dyak tribes, with Captain Bethune and a party, concludes thus:—

'The progress is ended; to-morrow, I shall be left in the solitude and the quiet of the jungle; but, after witnessing the happiness, the plenty, the growing prosperity of the Dyak tribes, I can scarcely believe that I could devote my life to a better purpose; and I dread that a removal might destroy what I have already done.'—Vol. ii. p. 161.

The remainder of the second volume is occupied with a general description of the Island of Borneo, and an account of the Dyak tribes; 'Mr. Brooke's Memorandum on the Piracy of the Malayan Archipelago,' written after the first blow struck at the pirate communities by Captain Keppel, but prior to the operations of the squadron under Admiral Sir Thomas Cochrane; 'Remarks by Mr. Crawford, late Governor of Singapore, on the advantages of a settlement on the north-west coast of Borneo, and the occupation of the island of Labuan; and an Appendix of Official Documents.'

Among these is a very valuable sketch of Borneo, by J. Hunt, Esq., communicated to Sir Thomas Stamford Raffles, when Lieutenant-Governor of Java, in 1812, which contains the fullest and most complete account of the topographical divisions and natural productions of the island that has appeared. It cannot have been for want of information, that British merchants have neglected this tempting field for enterprise. That the English were not always insensible to the value and importance of the once valuable commerce of Borneo, Mr. Hunt remarks, may be inferred, not only from the number of the Honourable Company's ships annually despatched to its ports prior to the year 1760, but from the efforts they have repeatedly made to establish themselves on its shores. We have seen

an old chart of the Borneo river, in which is inserted a reference to the British factory, the remains of which may still exist at Borneo. The failure of those successive attempts, as well as the exclusion of other European powers from the ports of Borneo, is to be attributed principally to the sordid jealousy and intrigues of the Dutch.

‘ By their intrigues at Banjarmassing, the British attempts at a settlement twice failed ; and Forrest, in his *Voyage to New Guinea*, says, that the Sulos were, by Dutch instigation, induced to cut off the infant establishment of Balambangan in 1775. They frustrated the attempts of the Bridgewater at Passir ; and even the massacre of the garrison of Pulo Condore was effected by Javanese soldiers supplied by the Governor of Batavia.’—Vol. ii. Appendix ii. xxv.

Both Balambangan and Pulo Condore were ill-chosen and most unhealthy spots ; and Mr. Hunt remarks, that, ‘ if a capital harbour, a navigable and majestic river, a productive country, a healthy site, population ready formed, and a commerce all-sufficient to pay the expenses of an establishment are required, the East India Company ought to have pitched upon Borneo Proper, which was once a flourishing country ; and a very short period under British auspices would render it the first mart in the East for China-Malayan commerce.’

‘ In looking over the map of the world, it is a melancholy reflection, to view so large a portion of the habitable globe as all Borneo, abandoned to barbarism and desolation ; that, with all her productive wealth and advantages of physical situation, her valuable and interesting shores should have been overlooked by all Europeans ; that neither the Dutch nor the Portuguese, with centuries of uncontrolled power in these seas, should have shed a ray of civilization on shores bordering upon their principal settlements ; that her ports and rivers, instead of affording a shelter to the extensive commerce of China, should, at this enlightened period of the world, hold out only terror and dismay to the mariner ; and that all that she should have acquired from the deadly vicinage and withering grasp of Dutch power and dominion has been, the art of more speedily destroying each other, and rendering themselves obnoxious to the rest of mankind.’

But this is not the whole case against the European powers who have abused their maritime ascendancy in these seas for the purposes of a selfish and narrow monopoly. By destroying the direct trade between Borneo and China, Mr. Hunt shows, the Portuguese and Dutch have compelled the Rajahs to have recourse to piratical practices. Formerly, the numbers of Chinese settled on its shores was immense ; and they kept up the

prosperity of the country by the tillage of the ground, as well as by the commerce of its ports. By degrees, the old Chinese settlers deserted these shores; and to supply the defalcation in their revenues, arising from the decay of commerce and the consequent depopulation, the Rajahs were tempted to turn their views to predatory warfare. In the same manner, slave-hunting is had recourse to by the African chiefs for the purpose of revenue, not in preference to legitimate commerce, but, in many cases, from the want of it. The only effective way to extirpate both piracy and slave-hunting is, by extending adequate protection to both the native cultivator and the native trader. To have suffered piratical hordes to carry on their predatory warfare in these seas for so many years, in defiance of the British flag, and almost to blockade our eastern ports, reflects great dishonour upon our Government. The chastisement inflicted upon the Borneo pirates by the expedition under Captain Keppel, and still more by Admiral Sir Thomas Cochrane's squadron, will no doubt have given a check to piracy for a time; but, unless a just and conciliatory policy, such as that adopted by Mr. Brooke at Sarawak, towards the native governments, shall inspire them with confidence, and they are guaranteed by the British flag against hostile incursions, we can hardly expect the benefit to be permanent. At present, almost every thing seems to depend upon the frail and invaluable life of an individual. The moral influence of Mr. Brooke's character is working wonders. According to the latest intelligence, all the native tribes in that part of the island were abandoning their feuds and petty warfare, and repairing to Sarawak, as the seat of justice, for the settlement of their disputes. Yet, up to this time, Mr. Brooke has not even a gun-boat, (except his own,) at his command, to protect his little state against any piratical incursion. His confidence in the Divine protection will, we have no doubt, be rewarded; but it is of the utmost importance, that what he has accomplished should not be placed in jeopardy by either the supineness, timidity, or wretched economy of the Home Government. By the convention of 1824, both Great Britain and the Netherlands Government are bound to use their best endeavours for the suppression of piracy. How well the Dutch have fulfilled their part of the engagement, is sufficiently notorious. The truth is, that they would rather connive at any practices that might check or injure our commerce in these seas. Their policy has undergone no change, except such as has been forced upon them by circumstances. They view the settlement made by Mr. Brooke, and the intended occupation of the island of Labuan with more than jealousy, and have even been extravagant enough to remonstrate with our Government against these proceedings.

No time ought to be lost in occupying Labuan as a naval port and commercial depôt. Now that steam communication has been established between Calcutta and Hong-Kong *via* Singapore, the importance of the coal-mines discovered in that island renders this step the more imperative. Labuan lies nearly in the direct track both of steam and of sailing navigation between India and China, during the north-east monsoon, being 707 miles from Singapore, and 1000 from Hong-Kong.* Its mines would also serve to keep the Hong-Kong, Singapore, and Penang stations supplied with fuel for steam vessels carrying the mails between Hong-Kong and Suez direct. At present, between Singapore and Hong-Kong, there is no British harbour, no accessible port of refuge; nor is there any other available supply of coal, that of Bengal and Australia excepted, to be found in the wide limits which extend east of the continents of Europe and America. As soon as the British flag shall be erected there, a large influx of settlers, especially of Chinese, may be with certainty reckoned upon. Chinese trade and immigration will come together; and Labuan, as a free port, will become the seat of a larger trade with China than Borneo ever possessed. The existence of a British settlement there would tend more than any thing else to the suppression of piracy. At the same time, the regular visits of British ships of war to the different ports of Borneo and the Archipelago, twice or thrice a-year, would be of incalculable advantage for the protection of British merchants, and for the repression of any attempt to revive piratical operations. All these considerations have been pressed upon the attention of the Home Government, by whom, we believe, their importance is fully recognized; but we are anxious that the British public should be led to take a more lively interest in the providential opening which is thus presented, both for the extension of our commerce, and for effecting a beneficent revolution in the physical and moral condition of the hitherto neglected millions of this fertile and beautiful region. 'Among the numerous visions which open to us, while reflecting on the new prospects of this vast island,' remarks Captain Keppel, 'so little known, yet known to possess almost unbounded means to invite and reward commercial activity, is the contemplation of the field it opens to *missionary labours*.

'When we read Mr. Brooke's description of the aboriginal Dyaks, and observe what he has himself done in one locality, within the space of four or five years, what may we not expect to be accom-

* Sarawak is distant from Singapore, 427 miles; from Labuan, 304; from Hong-Kong, 1199. Singapore may be reached, from Sarawak, by steam, in forty-eight hours.

plished by the zeal of Christian missionaries, judiciously directed, to reclaim such a people from barbarism ! There are here no prejudices of caste, as in India, to impede the missionaries' progress.'—Vol. ii., p. 226.

Had Sarawak been occupied for five years by a handful of French, Spanish, or Portuguese settlers, there would already have been a Roman Catholic mission established there. We trust that, ere long, a Protestant Malay mission will have entered upon this interesting field of exertion, with the view of extending the knowledge of a purer faith to this branch of the great Polynesian family.

Before we close this extended article, we must in justice say a few words upon the two other works before us. Mr. Davidson, of some of whose sensible observations we have availed ourselves, has contrived to turn his wanderings and adventures to excellent account for the amusement and information of others, whatever may have been the result to himself. He has crossed the Ocean, he tells us, in forty different square-rigged vessels,—has trod the plains of Hindostan, the wilds of Sumatra, and the mountains of Java,—has strolled among the beautiful hills and dales of Singapore and Penang,—has had many a gallop amid the forests and plains of Australia,—has threaded the reefy labyrinth of Torres' Straits, and visited the shores of the so-called Celestial Empire. His earlier recollections carry the reader back to Java, under the Dutch government of 1823 ; and he speaks both of the island and of the state of society at Batavia, at that time, in terms of warm eulogy. To Singapore, his recollections seem also to cling with a strong partiality, though its society is, he says, no longer so agreeable as it was ten or fifteen years ago. He has furnished some very pleasing sketches and valuable information relating to the Archipelago ; but the most useful, if not the most entertaining portion of the volume, is that which gives an account of his residence and experience as a farmer in New South Wales. His free strictures upon the causes of the recent depression in our Australian colonies, and his remarks upon emigration, appear to us highly deserving of attention ; and there are also some excellent practical suggestions relating to the openings for trade in the Far East, the commerce with China, and the new settlement of Hong-Kong. We have rarely met with a volume more entirely free from pretence of every kind, while conveying in a straight-forward, unaffected style, the results of so varied and extensive an experience, both as trader and as settler, in different climes, and where society presents such different aspects.

Mr. Earl's volume relates to *tropical* Australia, containing an

interesting narrative of the Port Essington expedition, and an account of the settlement at that extreme point of the northern coast, where it runs out towards the great island of Timor, in the track from Europe to China, from October to March, and the track from Sydney to India, from March to October. The importance of this settlement for checking piracy, seems scarcely inferior to that of Labuan, at the other extremity of the Archipelago.

‘Previously to the occupation of Port Essington,’ says Mr. Earl, ‘every English vessel that had resorted to the islands lying between Timor and New Guinea had been attacked, and, when successfully, the crew murdered; so that the names of many of the larger islands were associated with outrages committed on our countrymen. The Essington schooner, the first vessel sent out to the islands, was saved only by an accidental occurrence. But no sooner had it become known that the British possessed a settlement in the neighbourhood, than these aggressions suddenly and totally ceased. Indeed, I speak advisedly when I say, that small vessels may now traverse the adjacent seas with greater safety than they can coast the island of Java, the oldest established of the European colonies in the Indian Archipelago. The western coasts of New Guinea were never visited by our merchant-ships for purposes of trade previously to our establishment in these seas; but an intercourse has now been opened, which bids fair to become a thriving and profitable branch of commerce. The Timor Laut groupe, again, the nearest to Port Essington of the islands of the Archipelago, were so notorious, previously to our arrival, that even the native traders of the eastern islands dared not visit it. Vessel after vessel, whether English, Dutch, Chinese, or Macassar, was cut off and plundered. But the spirit of peace has now extended itself to this important groupe, and it has become a favorite resort for traders; an intercourse having been established with ports, especially on the southern part of Timor Laut, which were never before frequented.’—*Earl*, pp. 68-9.

The voyage from Sydney to Port Essington usually occupies from fifteen to twenty-five days. The colonists are bent upon opening, if practicable, an overland route from the present frontier of the province of New South Wales to the shores of the Indian Ocean, with a view to secure the advantage of the Indian overland mail. Mr. Davidson thinks, that, during the north-west monsoon, the navigation of Torres’ Straits from west to east would be found practicable for steamers, and that the mail might be better transmitted by sea. By this route, ‘the passenger for Sydney would find himself at his journey’s end in sixty-three or sixty-five days from Southampton, while the mail, *viâ* Marseilles, would be of four days’ shorter date.’ Such are the wondrous facilities afforded by the application of steam to

navigation, for the rapid interchange of mercantile communications, the strengthening of social ties, and the diffusion of the benefits of civilization by means of commerce over all the regions of the earth. The marvellous regularity and certainty of the intercourse thus established between this country and the chain of colonies which encircle the globe, are not less striking and important than the shortening, in point of time, of geographical distance. No settler in any British colony, however remote, can now feel himself a hopeless exile cut off from the means of hearing of friends at home, except at distant and uncertain intervals. In Dr. Morrison's journal, we find the following affecting entry, under the date of July 18, 1834:—'Two hundred and twenty days are now nearly completed since you left. Surely in twenty days more, if the Lord spare my life, I shall hear of your safe arrival in England.' At the end of those twenty days, the letters arrived, but the heart so deeply interested in their contents had ceased to beat! Mrs. Morrison had arrived in England on the 6th of April, after a favorable voyage of nearly four months. Her lamented husband died on the 1st of August, without having heard of her arrival. This was not quite twelve years ago. Now, London letters by the overland mail reach Calcutta in less than forty days, and Hong-Kong or Canton in about forty more. Thus, in less than twelve weeks, intelligence from London will reach China by this route; and the time is probably not very distant, when, by means of more perfect arrangements, answers to letters from Calcutta to London may be obtained in seventy days; and answers to letters from Hong-Kong to London, in one hundred and forty, instead of two hundred and forty days. China is not merely 'opened,' but half the intervening distance is annihilated, while India is brought nearer to us than the further shores of the Atlantic used to be.

Art. IV.—*Debates, Reports of Committees, Petitions, Papers and Notices of Motions in Parliament in 1845 and 1846, respecting a Change in our Colonial Policy, and in favour of Improvements in the Administration of Affairs in the Colonies, in India and China.*

A FULL catalogue of the documents of which this title is a summary, would be far too long for the heading of an article in a review.

But these documents are deeply interesting. They relate to almost every branch of our colonial affairs; they are the fruits of bitter experience, to which influential members of the legis-

lature thus bear practical testimony ; and they indicate, (more especially *the notices of motions*,) that at length the time is really come for changes and for reforms, without which our vast Colonial Government must continue to be no less a disgrace to ourselves than a scourge to the millions whom it oppresses.

The objects of the parliamentary motions to which we refer, and the names of the movers, will sufficiently explain the character of the reforms, of which we now anticipate the early accomplishment ; and the *variety* of the inquiries which these motions have in view, proves satisfactorily, that a principle of the greatest importance is likely to prevail throughout this work.

That principle was vindicated in the last century by Edmund Burke, who would have saved America to Great Britain, had his counsels been listened to ; and who insisted earnestly upon the necessity of studying the *diversity* of the countries we govern, in order to apply our laws wisely to their respective circumstances.

‘I was never wild enough,’ said Burke, ‘to conceive that one method would serve for the whole of this mighty and strangely diversified Empire—that the natives of Hindostan, and those of Virginia could be ordered in the same manner, or that the Cutchery courts and the grand jury of Salem could be regulated on a similar plan.’*

Carefully keeping this great principle in view, we here accompany a brief sketch of the existing parliamentary proceedings † in favour of what seems to be fast approaching—a thorough colonial reform, with some observations upon its leading objects.

The general subject of such reform is opened by Mr. Hume, ‡ in a motion for the production of a code for the administration of colonial affairs, issued by Charles II., in the year 1670. At that period, much practical knowledge of colonization had been gained in an experience of one hundred and seventy years, from the days of Sebastian Cabot, its great leader in the sixteenth century, so ably followed by the settlers of Virginia and Maryland, the pilgrims of New England, and the planters of the West India Islands ; and the document in question, con-

* Burke’s letter to the Sheriffs of Bristol, 1777. Works, vol. iii. p. 182.

† The various motions referred to in the text were made in 1845 and 1846 by Sir R. Peel, Mr. Hume, Mr. Hawes, Mr. Buller, Mr. Ewart, Mr. O’Connell, Mr. Tuffnell, Mr. Forster, Mr. Trelawny, Mr. Aglionby, Dr. Bowring, Mr. P. M. Stewart, Mr. M. Gibson, and Mr. Masterman. In addition to the proceedings urged by these members, the New Zealand debates contain remarkable speeches on principles of colonial government by Mr. Ellice, Mr. Colquhoun, Lord Howick (now Earl Grey,) Lord John Russell, and fourteen other members of the House of Commons.

‡ H. of C. votes, 3rd of April, 1846. One MS. copy of this document is in the Brit. Mus.—Harl. MSS. No. 6394.

taining the instructions given to the plantations' committee by King Charles must have proceeded from the labours of the Earl of Clarendon, who is known to have deeply studied colonial affairs.* This document contains a *system* of colonial administration at home; and it forms an extensive basis of what ought to be the practice of the colonial office in Downing-street; of which it is really the forgotten law. It is the more valuable, as it is universal in its objects and equal in its scheme—not severing whites from blacks, or colonists from aborigines; but aiming at the good of all, as an amalgamated body, and by adherence to the rules of *justice*,—according to the degree in which various classes of men were, in those days, held to be entitled to it; for it recognises the right of having *slaves*. Its main principle was that our administrators should obtain knowledge of colonial facts.

The next important parliamentary document is last year's report of a committee on colonial accounts, in support of which comes this year a string of motions by Mr. Hume for the production of public colonial defaulters' papers. Dr. Bowring, the chairman of this committee, has given notice of a motion for the further examination of the subject.

Another motion applicable to *all* the colonies was made last year by Mr. Hawes, in respect of *official appointments*. This is a subject of some delicacy. Prosecuted with prudence, the inquiry might advantageously give fresh vigour to the good old law of Richard the Second, against seeking public posts by favour. It must lead also to a proper system of supervision and protection of public officers. At present they either act without any responsibility themselves, or they are subject to the despotism of their superiors without appeal. Mr. Hawes may pursue this topic with great effect. Let the wrong motives for appointing inefficient men to colonial offices be fully exposed; and the worse motives for excluding efficient men from colonial employments be fairly stated; and such a case of mal-administration for many years past, will be brought home to the colonial office, as must compel reform.

Mr. Forster has given notice of an important motion for the establishment of a better *system* for the internal government of our settlements in West Africa; and for their more suitable intercourse with the neighbouring tribes. He has also obtained papers respecting the members of the colonial legislatures, in colonies where there is no elective popular assembly, whilst Mr. O'Connell has obtained papers on New South Wales; and Mr. Tuffnell others on Ceylon.

Mr. Trelawny has moved for a return of the names of the

* Lord Clarendon's own report of the Barbadoes case, in the Privy Council, is most valuable.

agents of the *Crown* colonies, their emoluments, and duties; details already laid before a commission on colonial affairs, which made several valuable reports fifteen years ago.

The motions of Mr. Ewart and Mr. C. Buller, respecting convict transportation can hardly fail of exciting deep interest. A more cruel act of legislation was never passed than that which founded a convict colony in 1786; and the efforts of these gentlemen will deserve all honour if they stop the new project of extending the fatal establishment of European crime in *the neighbourhood* of the populous islands of the East. On this occasion it should not be forgotten, that the intervention of the House of Commons in 1784, stopped a similar frightful blunder in the dispersal of convicts in Western Africa.

The late melancholy wreck in Bass's Straits has led to the production of papers, on the motion of Mr. Hume, respecting *light-houses* on those coasts;—a subject calling loudly for serious attention in regard to all the dangerous shores frequented by our shipping, as shown by the Light-House Committee of 1845; and Sir Robert Peel has opened another great maritime question by moving for papers against a tax proposed for colonial built ships.

These propositions of 1845, and 1846, had intelligible precursors; of which Sir Robert Peel's declaration of 1844, that the colonies must be henceforth dealt with as *integral* parts of the empire was received with delight in its remotest regions. More specific prospects of realizing that principle were distinctly traced in the determination of Sir George Murray, in 1829, to *revive* annual colonial budgets for the House of Commons;—in Mr. Ward's colonial crown-lands committee of 1836;—in Mr. Buxton's aborigines committee of 1835, 1836, and 1837;—in Sir William Molesworth's transportation inquiry;—and in the series of annual motions of Mr. Smith O'Brien upon grants of land in the colonies. In the same spirit of reform, the late Lord Bathurst sent commissioners of inquiry to the eastern colonies, to the West Indies, and to Western Africa; and about the same time the late Sir R. Wilmot Horton originated parliamentary proceedings of great importance respecting emigration, followed up with unequal success by Mr. Baring's excellent bill of 1838, and by Mr. Wakefield's extraordinary efforts,—marred by his powerful party having trusted the Colonial Office in 1840.

Mr. Hume has made the most strenuous efforts to urge the realization of Sir R. Peel's just principle; more especially by claiming *free trade and self-government* for the colonists.

In the House of Lords, also, the subject has not been neglected. The Duke of Wellington, and the Marquis of Lans-

downe, have strongly urged the need of a *system* to regulate our new colonial and commercial intercourse with China; the want of which must have occasioned disasters but for Sir Henry Pottinger's admirable conduct.

The unsatisfactory state of the Privy Council, the great court of colonial appeals, has often been complained of in the House of Lords, during the last twenty-four years; and their Lordships now possess in Earl Grey, one who by his frank avowal of our error in colonial policy, and by his acute perception of its cause, has shewn some qualities calculated to correct that great error by a radical change in the present practice. We allude to the speech of Lord Howick, now Earl Grey, upon the disasters in New Zealand—a subject for the privy council restored to its legitimate jurisdiction.

These proceedings evince a considerable activity in parliament on the subject of our colonies. But it would be a great mistake to suppose that nothing more remains to be done. On the contrary, two topics of paramount importance are not touched upon at all in the motions actually before parliament, namely, the question of a representation of colonists in the House of Commons; and that of a body of delegates in the nature of a colonial council to represent the interests of the colonies in connexion with the Secretary of State. A third topic, which will also demand the gravest consideration, was seriously examined by Mr. Ellice alone, of all the speakers in the New Zealand debate last year, namely, the absolute necessity of introducing free legislative assemblies, on the main principle of self-government, into all our *crown* colonies. This last topic was discussed at some length in a former number of the 'Eclectic Review,'* where the novelty of such *crown* colonies was proved from the uniform tenor of our colonial history.

Much more is wanting—and most urgently wanting, than all this. Earl Grey said truly, that our error in colonial *policy* arises from our ignorance of colonial *facts*. His lordship as truly declared, from his own official experience, that this deplorable ignorance is shared by the ministers of the crown. The proofs of the correctness of these observations are but too flagrant; as can be seen in our very recent experience in regard to one quarter of the world—Africa, the favourite object, for very good reason, alike of popular, of philanthropic, and even of court and ministerial sympathy.

Yet undeniable it is, that the climate of Africa, the productions of Africa, and the warlike capabilities of Africans, have been in these latter days so entirely sealed, even to the Colonial Office, that great calamities have arisen from its ignorance of

* In the article on Franklin's Works, by Mr. J. Sparks, July, 1843.

things which might easily, and certainly ought to have been familiarly known.*

How fatal did our ignorance of the fevers of the Niger prove ! Equally productive of injury to the industry and civilization of the natives of western Africa, has our ignorance of their *coffee*† proved ; and last year, to our no small disgrace and damage, a combined squadron of English and French ships attacked a town in Madagascar, in ignorance of the existence of its formidable fortifications ; and really because both governments, our own as well as the French, have rejected the proffered diplomatic intercourse of the queen of Madagascar. Worse disasters still have been the results of this ignorance in the case of Natal in South Africa ; and this is an example, which deserves as careful statement as can be made in a few words.

In December, 1845, the colony of Natal was formally established with its due array of authorities, civil and judicial ; when it appeared that the great mass of the *white* population had settled in the interior ; and it is believed that many of the whites who remain, will also go thither.—That is to say, thousands of *British subjects* prefer incurring all the casualties of a new African emigration, with the prospect of a probably unhealthy climate, to remaining in a British colony, although cheap and valuable land is abundant ; although *its institutions are not unsuited to their habits* ; and although the climate is unquestionably good. It is, at the same time, capable almost of demonstration, that an ordinarily prudent management of the affairs of South Africa, would *even now* make these people content with their lot in Natal under British sovereignty.

Already extremely bloody conflicts have taken place between these emigrants, the black natives, and ourselves ; the emigrants having, since 1836, lost more than six hundred men, women, and children, by the sword, the blacks more than twelve thousand ; and our troops having also suffered in a pitched battle with our own subjects.

These evils may reasonably be attributed to the ignorance of the colonial office ; and there has been even an unusual reserve of parliamentary documents on this whole case. From 1837, not a line has been published for parliament upon it, except a few meagre and incorrect incidental notices, in the reports of the land and emigration commissioners, although, at least, one call has been made in the House of Commons (by Colonel Fox) specially for Natal papers. So that a new colony is adopted by

* Five centuries ago, Roger Bacon urged the importance of knowledge of such things : *Cognitio locorum mundi valde necessaria est rei publicæ, &c.*—*Opus Majus*, 1733—p. 189.

† House of Commons Papers, 1839.No. 528, p. 4.

the crown without the cognizance of parliament, contrary to the express recommendation of the aborigines committee.

The delay in settling the government at Natal, has done enormous mischief; and is solely attributable to the colonial office. At length, when, the other day, this body of 800 English, and 1500 Dutch colonists, with 100,000 natives, were rescued from anarchy, so great had become their despondency, that, says the local newspaper, 'hope deferred had made the hearts of the people sick; and when the news arrived of the landing of the lieutenant governor, many refused to believe, to them, so improbable a fact.'* Yet, three years and a half ago, when a reconciliation was made with the Cape emigrants, the military officer who negotiated with them, solemnly pledged himself, that in *a few months*, as might have been easily accomplished, government should be provided for them.

This is one of the cases, indeed, which, for its past bad effects, and *its present extremely dangerous position*, ought to be immediately inquired into by parliament; and such *misfeasance*, and *non-feasance* of official duty be signally punished, unless we mean that the government of the colonies shall continue to be a mockery.

Respecting the Caffre frontier also, a scene of the extremest interest, in hope to the philanthropist, and in principle to the statesman, not a line has been laid before parliament since 1837, although treaties of great importance were made there in pursuance of the advice of parliament, and although the articles of those treaties have been formally altered, whilst the colonists have lately been deeply agitated with rumours of invasions,—perhaps exaggerated rumours, but certainly most disquieting, from ignorance of preceding facts.

At the present moment a correct view of the whole affairs of South Africa would do more for the civilization of its tribes, and for the advancement of British interests to the tropics, than the most sanguine speculator on the good progress of humanity could venture to state in detail. A vast portion of that whole region is fit for fine-woolled sheep; † now increasing with surprising steadiness and rapidity there; and every problem of philanthropy might easily receive its safe and satisfactory solution under our hands in the same region, if its administration

* *Cape Frontier Times*, 13 January, 1846.

† The increase of fine wool from South Africa stands thus:—in 1843, the export was lbs. 1,700,000; in 1844, it was lbs. 2,270,000; and in 1845, it was lbs. 3,600,000,—the price having exceeded the price of the best Australian wool. This is a great triumph to the industrious South Africans; and it deserves to be recorded that the foundation of this success was laid by a Dutch native of the colony, now enjoying his reward in an honoured old age.—This is Michael Breda, a member of council at Cape Town.

were conducted on principles of common sense, and in the way dictated by the constitution.

Another case is also of extreme interest, and the ignorance of the Colonial office on this subject, would be ground of an impeachment, *if so many secretaries of state were not concerned in it*. It involves the question of penitentiary discipline, and that of the administration of a convict colony. In the debate in the House of Lords upon the Van Dieman's Land petition, Lord Stanley, the late Secretary of State for the colonies, founded an apology for the deficiencies of a *new* plan of penal discipline he had devised, upon the distance of the colony from England.

'There was no subject,' said his lordship, 'which had given him more anxiety than this; no subject to which he had more constantly and systematically directed his attention with a view of finding out some remedy for these acknowledged inconveniences. But it took a long time to establish perfectly a system of convict discipline, where all the arrangements to be carried out were to be made between parties at such a distance from each other, and where such a great lapse of time as twelve months necessarily intervened between a communication and a reply.'*

This is a melancholy instance of the slovenly discharge of its duty by the Colonial Office. By an act of parliament framed upon the most able report of the late Mr. John Thomas Bigge, not an offence of the lightest character can take place in our convict establishments, without such records being kept as mark the precise extent of criminality in the population. Transcripts of those records are sent to the Colonial Office. They were on one occasion, through the zeal of Mr. Briscoe, the then member for Surrey, brought before the House of Commons.

Proper analyses, and digests, of these invaluable records, so wisely provided for by act of parliament, would present such a picture of the morality, or immorality of the people, that the working of every change of system could be judged of with unerring certainty.

The discreditable fact is, that Lord Stanley was unprovided with these materials to enlighten him, or he could not have talked of a *twelve month's* correspondence, and of the aid he received from the attorney general and the secretary of New South Wales, who *happened to be in London*.

It is probable, too, that in the Colonial Office, nothing whatever is known now of this act of parliament—of these records—or of their transcripts.

It is fair to our readers to explain how we speak thus posi-

* Morning Herald, 4th March, 1846—so the Times.

tively on a subject belonging to so remote a colony. The hand that writes this article carried the Act of Parliament to New South Wales in 1823; drew the forms for the records, prescribed by the act; attended to their transmission home; and witnessed their production by Mr. Briscoe to the House of Commons.

The affairs of India do not, in all respects, need the same reforms as the colonies. Nevertheless they would be benefitted by a better system of intelligence on our part as to the views of our Asiatic neighbours; since the peace of India would certainly be promoted by more exact knowledge of us being conveyed among our neighbours. A striking illustration of the latter point may be seen in an interesting narrative of the visit of a French traveller to the Sikh Rajah Ghoolab Singh, at this moment, perhaps, the main instrument by whom peace will be restored to India.

‘Ghoolab-Sing,’* said M. Jacquemont, in 1831, ‘is a soldier of fortune, a sort of usurper. He is a lion in war—a man of forty, very handsome, with the plainest, mildest, and most elegant manners. He took me to see the salt mines.

‘Europe, in the most common details of its civilization, is a wonder to these people. They will listen to you all day, with pleasure, when talking of it.

‘Two arm chairs were sent on before us; and if we passed near a shady tree, or when I had bundles of plants to tie up, the Rajah and I sat down. He made his two secretaries dismount, and write down what I said.

‘These people, above all things, like to hear the political statistics of Europe. They have no idea of them, of our population, of the *strength of our armies*—of the product of our public revenue—of our civil and criminal laws—and, lastly, of the results of science, applied to the arts.

‘In the mines I taught Ghoolab Singh a little geology.’†

The lessons of the lively traveller were not the only opportunities which the Sikh chief has had of judging correctly of our

* This is the same chief of whom the Governor-General of India in his despatch of the 19th February, says:—

‘I told the Rajah, thus I recognised the wisdom, prudence, and good feeling evinced by him in having kept himself separated from the unjustifiable hostilities of the Sikhs, and I was prepared to mark my sense of that conduct in the proceedings which now must be carried through. I stated, in the most marked manner and words, my satisfaction that he who had not participated in the offence, and whose wisdom and good feeling towards the British Government were well known, has been the person chosen to negotiate the means of atonement; and the terms on which the Sikh Government might be rescued from impending destruction, by a return to amicable relations with the British Government.

† Jacquemont’s Letters from India, vol. ii. p. 3.

power; and proper means may be devised for the general indulgence of this inquisitiveness, which is really a mark of capacity for higher civilization. So that whilst our tranquil relations with this people may be secured through their knowledge of our superiority, their progress will be promoted by a more intimate acquaintance with our means of attaining wealth and with our superior general resources.

Other illustrations of good colonial government may be found in the history of Indian legislation. For example:—

‘The case of the various Hill people of India refutes the opinion that savages cannot be improved. A single document, of so old a date as 1822, will conveniently open that case. It is entitled “A REGULATION * for exempting the Garrow mountaineers and other rude Tribes on the North-eastern Frontier of Rungpore from the operation of the existing Regulations; and for establishing a special system of Government for the tract of country occupied by them, or bordering on their possessions.” It states the case as follows:—
 “There exist in different parts of the territories subordinate to the Presidency of Fort William, races of people entirely distinct from the ordinary population, and to whose circumstances, therefore, the system of government established by the general regulations is wholly inapplicable. Such were the mountaineers of Bhaugulpore, for the reclaiming of whom to the arts of civilized life special arrangements were made by Government with the chiefs, some time before the introduction of the present system. These arrangements still subsist, having been incorporated into the code by the provisions of Regulation I. 1796, under which an entirely distinct system has been established for the administration of justice amongst the inhabitants of that mountainous tract. Savage tribes, in some respects similar, exist on the north-east frontier of Rungpore, of which the race denominated Garrows, and occupying the hills called after them, are the principal. *As yet little has been done to reclaim or civilize these people.* The reciprocal animosity which subsists between them and the inhabitants of the cultivated country, prevents any extensive intercourse of a specific nature; while, on the contrary, their mutual injuries have produced feuds leading frequently to disturbance and bloodshed. The zemindars of the frontier have, there is reason to believe, usually been the aggressors, by encroaching on the independent territory of the Garrows and similar rude tribes, until, *despairing of other resource, the latter are driven to seize occasions of private revenge and retaliation.* These encroachments having been of long standing, several zemindars were, at the time of the perpetual settlement, in the receipt of incomes derived from cesses of various kinds levied from the tribes, and hence a portion of the tract of country occupied by them has been considered to lie within the operation of the general regulations, as forming part of the zemindarees. This, however, instead of conducing to reclaim the tribes to civilized

* House of Commons papers for 1824, No. 114.

habits, has rather had a contrary effect, the system being totally inapplicable to their savage and secluded condition, and being calculated to leave them at the mercy of the zemindars, rather than to offer any substantial means of redress. *The condition of the Garrow mountaineers and of the other rude tribes on that frontier has, for some time past, attracted much of the attention of the Governor-general in council, and the circumstances which have conduced to check the progress of civilization amongst them have been fully investigated and ascertained.* With a view, therefore, to promote the desirable object of reclaiming these races to the habits of civilized life, it seems necessary that *a special plan for the administration of justice, of a kind adapted to their peculiar customs and prejudices,* SHOULD BE ARRANGED AND CONCERTED WITH THE HEAD MEN, and that measures should at the same time be taken for freeing them from any dependence on the zemindars of the British provinces; *compensation* being of course made to the latter for any just pecuniary claims they may have over them.'

'This narrative, (which is only one of several) displays the views entertained for many years by the Indian government on the subject. With a large experience, that government concludes, that the savage *may be civilized* by a system of justice and conciliation; and it is to be expected that the new spirit shown by the House of Commons in the late debates, will lead to *a full inquiry as to the fittest way to introduce such a system universally;*' * SINCE EXPERIENCE HAS PROVED ITS VALUE.

Indian history has, also, just added a *second* example of British magnanimity in refusing to appropriate a country won by the fortune of war. In the first case, that of Caffreland, in South Africa, in 1836, the distinguished general, Sir Harry Smith, saw the dawn of a new system of humane policy, of which he may, perhaps, be destined to witness the complete developement in every part of the British world—a policy that will permit the unlimited peaceful extension of our dominions, provided it violates no rights, nor outrages the common sentiments of national independence.

In order to realize so large a view of colonial greatness, it would be necessary to enter deeply into every separate head of colonial affairs; and into the affairs of every colony separately.

At present the case of New Zealand is, perhaps, the grand source of the interest taken in favour of colonial reform.

In fact, in June and July last, a revolution was begun in British colonial policy, upon the occasion of the affairs of New Zealand being examined by the House of Commons; when, for the first time since the Canada debate of 1791, or even since the old American war, serious attention was given in parlia-

* Introduction to the 'Classical Sources of British History,' by S. Bannister, formerly Attorney General of New South Wales, p. 105.

ment to great colonial topics ; and the character of the change is seen in the analogous movement making in the far wider field of our domestic and commercial policy at large, as affected by the corn-laws. In the New Zealand case, almost forgotten in the greater interests which now absorb attention, Sir R. Peel set Lord Stanley and the Colonial Office aside, because he perceived that public opinion condemned them both, and would speedily compel parliament to condemn them ; as in the case of the corn-laws, he has now set Lord Stanley, and his friends the ultra-conservatives, aside, because he again sees that their views, in regard to those greater interests, are opposed to the peremptory demands of the age.

The New Zealand case is important in itself, in whichever of its several lights it is looked at ; whether in reference to the rights of the natives, whom the wretched system of our Colonial Office has brought into a fearful conflict ;—or, in reference to the extensive success of the missionaries, who, if not corrupted by being made political instruments, may still contribute largely to the rescue of the natives ;—or, in reference to British interests and British honour, both deeply concerned in the establishment of a system of government capable of conciliating our colonization of New Zealand with the natives' rights. But in reference to the opening of a new policy for all our colonies, which the result of the debates of June and July clearly promised, their importance cannot be exaggerated. They were distinguished, too, by several memorable circumstances. In the first place, they were in no sense whatever *party* debates. The most earnest arguments in favour of a new system, and the severest condemnation of the present practice, proceeded from firm friends of the ministers. Again, the various topics incident to the case were discussed in unusual detail by several groups of speakers, as if their respective parts had been carefully *cast* in concert ; although it was plain, that the whole was unpremeditated. All the members, with perhaps the natural exception of the mover, Mr. Charles Buller, obviously spoke unprepared, and all without exception from honest conviction. In some instances, indeed, as in those of Mr. Roebuck, and Sir R. Peel himself, the knowledge of the subject was remarkably small, and the conclusions hasty to rashness. Taken, however, as a whole, these debates form an excellent point of departure for the consideration of the great change, which is indispensable in this branch of our public affairs.

Three of the speakers fully explained the causes of our colonial misfortunes in a very few words ; and satisfactory remedies may be suggested for the evils, the sources of which were thus clearly pointed out.

Mr. Milnes said he had found the subject of colonies *odious* to all parties, even to those statesmen to whom is entrusted the duty of administering them. He himself had to struggle against a strong prejudice in resolving to support the proposed inquiry, notwithstanding the fatal and shameful indifference of more experienced men.

Lord Howick (now Earl Grey), said, that our present colonial policy is essentially erroneous, and that the error arises from **IGNORANCE**.* Having once filled a post in the Colonial Office, his lordship founded this double reproach upon personal experience.

Mr. Barkly gave, if possible, severer testimony against the practices of that office; and his testimony was that of one who frankly acknowledged the courtesies he had himself received in it, but who reluctantly declared its practice to be opposed to all sound principle, and guided solely by a degrading expediency; and by what is called a *see-saw*, between contending parties.

The chain is complete. *Indifference* to colonial affairs charged by Mr. Milnes upon the eminent leaders of all parties, then crowded about him in the House of Commons, necessarily produces the *ignorance* which Lord Howick admitted himself to have shared; and indifference and ignorance together, as necessarily generate the *error* which his lordship, last summer, warmly and successfully appealed to Parliament to renounce; whilst such indifference, ignorance, and error, could not fail in their turn to carry the government headlong into the system of tergiversation and shuffling, reproved by Mr. Barkly.

Sir Robert Peel deserves the credit of seeing the force of the combination thus formed against Lord Stanley from every shade of party; and he wisely gave way before an overwhelming resistance to the Government, without even pretending to understand the subject under discussion. His speeches were striking examples of that ignorance of facts, to which Lord Howick correctly attributed a great error in our colonial policy; and of that violation of correct constitutional principles, which is one of the most dangerous results of that error. Sir R. Peel even assumed against all authority, as good colonial law, that the *discovery* of a savage country by British subjects entitles the Crown to the sovereignty of that country, *without the consent of the natives*. He went further, adding that the true way of settling difficulties in New Zealand from the first was to have acted upon this title; and he even regretted that such a course had not been pursued. Seeing, then, that we have faith in the sincerity of his declaration in Exeter

* This ignorance in colonial affairs is not new: Lord Macartney attributed the loss of America to it.—*Burke's Correspondence*, vol. iii., p. 27.

Hall several years ago,—that he was a true, although a recent philanthropist,—we are entitled to call upon him to reconsider positions opposed as much to our old law, as to the dictates of philanthropy;—and which are sanctioned only by a modern practice, that becomes destructive according as the British nation becomes more enlightened and powerful.

Positive authority of a peculiar character, is not wanting in favour of the humane view of native rights on this head; for the instructions to Captain Cook, on his third voyage, issued in compliance with the strongly expressed sentiments of the times,* required the *consent* of the natives as the condition precedent to the occupation of their country by British authority; and our Indian law, cited above, recognised the principle.

The instructions here alluded to, were introduced in Cook's last voyage, in compliance with public opinion. The period was that in which Granville Sharp (the real originator of our modern philanthropy, and the precursor of Clarkson and Wilberforce, Macaulay and Buxton,) began his marvellous efforts in favour of slaves and free aborigines. Afterwards the latter were neglected in our exclusive vindication of negroes. That is to say, at a period when the extension of our colonies in the South Seas was looked upon as a proper object of British policy, the ministers held it to be their duty to insert in the document originating our acquisition of new countries there, a substantial acknowledgment of the right of the rudest savage to independence. The history of our old colonies is consistent with this solemn act of authority. The rule was afterwards disregarded, at a period when almost every other incident to safe colonization was renounced. Despotie governments were established in all the new colonies on various grounds. Convict settlements were formed at first to the exclusion of free colonists, and at last to the neglect of every good principle of colonization. Missionaries were long discountenanced; and the natives were everywhere more or less oppressed and often exterminated.

The result was, that colonies fell into great public disfavour. The jobbing, and enormous waste of money which they caused, induced some economists, such as those of the Parnell school, to call for the abandonment of colonies, instead of insisting loudly upon the reform of their abuses. The philanthropists, also, instead of demanding colonial reform, as a means of protecting the natives, had long † leaned to the opinion, that

* Dr. Johnson and Adam Smith joined warmly in the public reproof of the massacres of natives in Captain Cook's first voyage. Dr. Hawkesworth lost the post of historiographer to the subsequent voyages for inserting an apology for these massacres in his first book.

† The Jesuits acted on this opinion in Paraguay. Eliot did so in New

their only protection was to *stop* colonization, utterly regardless of the impossibility of doing so. At the same time a sense of incapacity to govern extending colonies, led successive ministries to make the same vain attempt.

In the mean time, old colonists required fresh lands for their increasing families and flocks; and a new emigrating population from home after the general peace, of course required fresh fields of enterprize. From both causes, arose an immense extension of our colonial territory in all quarters, in spite of the resistance of the government, which indeed, after many struggles, adopted vast regions it had refused to acquire upon a rational and humane system. That refusal constituted the *error* confessed by Lord Grey.

Our colonial office in Downing-street is governed by principles, and it pursues practices, which must inevitably, from the nature of things, bring disaster upon all within their range. They oppress private men; they destroy public prosperity; and by a just reaction they expose, degrade, and ultimately ruin those by whom official authority is thus abused.

This is the effect of a picture drawn of those principles and practices by one of the subordinate members of the colonial office itself; who writes, he says, from experience, not from theory. We quote his charge, word for word; and leave the topic to the reader's indignant reflections:

'By evading decisions where they can be evaded; by shifting them on other departments, where by any possibility they can be shifted; by giving decisions upon superficial examinations; by conciliating loud and energetic individuals at the expence of such public interests as are dumb, or do not attract attention; by sacrificing what is feeble and obscure to what is influential and cognizable, by such means and shifts as these the *Secretary of State* may reduce his business within his power, and obtain the reputation of a safe man without any other reproach than that which belongs to men placing themselves in a way to have their understandings abused and debased, their sense of justice corrupted, their public spirit and appreciation of public objects undermined.'—*The Statesman*, 1836, p. 152.

Hence an intriguer in the Colonial Office, taking advantage of single points, is enabled to ruin honourable men, if their general good conduct is no protection.

England. John Newton and Wilberforce agreed, before New South Wales was founded, that no colonization *at all* ought to be begun in New Holland, when they should have joined the party which opposed the wretched colonization of convicts there. The philanthropists are at length changing their views. Lord Ashley seconded Mr. C. Buller's motion for a new system of colonization; and Mr. Gurney and Sir Edward Buxton supported that new system.

Sir Robert Peel has recently put this point strongly, in reference to the case of the Governor General of India:—

'I will say,' he declared, *'that it will be destructive of the character of the nation,* it must be a fatal check upon the energies of public men, if you once establish the precedent that you will not allow the general conduct and services of a public man, who may be acting at a distance of five thousand miles, to be pleaded against a single act of indiscretion.' *

But what if the facts as to an alleged indiscretion are disputed, and if in the colonial office a hearing be refused, and the secretary of state prevents the Queen referring claims to the privy council, to decide the dispute upon good evidence and just principles? Then, indeed, we may say, that Bentham was right when he declared that 'abominable intrigue must blind ministers;' and if the system does not make them base, as Mr. Taylor asserts it does, it renders them subservient to others who are base, which is worse. Such a denial of a hearing is directly against the constitution.

The practice of great injustice accompanies and leads to great national calamities. Our colonial empire stands upon the ruins of three which have fallen; and most remarkable it is, that in all three—those of Portugal, Holland, and France—signal injustice marked and preceded their decay.

Camoens says of Portuguese India, that it had become 'the step-mother of honest men, but a nursing parent to villains.'

Tavernier says of Dutch India, that once the Dutch government most scrupulously heard appeals against their distant governors; but in his time the protection of great men only could secure a hearing to the best cause. And another French writer has drawn a picture of the practice of that government, whose hideous features have to the minutest line been reproduced in our days in England.

'The Dutch establishments in India,' says Raynal, 'were now in the extremest bad order; but their reform was the more difficult, since things were as bad at home as abroad. The ministers for the Dutch colonies, instead of being men of business and colonial experience, were usually taken from powerful families which monopolised the great offices. These families were busy, some with their political and party intrigues, some with the more general concerns of the state; and they looked to colonial affairs either to advance the power of their party, or to get places for their connexions; or from worse motives of pecuniary interest. The real business of the colonies, its details, discussions on all points, and with all the men actually engaged in them, and the greatest enterprizes were turned over to a

* House of Commons, 9th Feb. 1843.

secretary, who, under the title of counsel to the office, got everything into his own hands. The ministers came only occasionally to the office, especially during the intervals of the more pressing public calls of business; so that they lost sight of its connecting links. Consequently they were compelled to trust implicitly to the counsel. It was his business to read all the dispatches from the colonies, and to frame all the replies to them. He was generally acute—often corrupt—always dangerous as a guide. Sometimes he was known to lead his superiors into terrible difficulties of his own contriving; and at other times to leave them in scrapes created by their own errors.'—Raynal. *Histoire Philosophique, &c., &c.*, Vol. I. p. 466.

This extremely striking passage furnishes a warning to us. This system of administration is ours almost to the letter; and, as Lord Shelburne said, it lost us *old* America. The Dutch would not abandon corruptions, which hastened their fall. It remains to be seen, whether some attempt cannot be made to add to the stability of our *new* colonial empire, by the timely reform, *which our better popular elements admit of*.

In France it took twenty years before Lally Tollendal could obtain the acknowledgment of the innocence of his murdered father. The fall of French India, if owing to our superiority, was at least attended by the notorious injustice which enfeebles integrity, and invigorates every mischievous passion.* We are now pursuing this last career, of refusing to be just: and if the vigour of the national character arising from other influences, goes far to counteract the effect of this canker, it is not to be doubted that it paralyzes the vigour which would ensure public prosperity.

The cure is—to open the Privy Council *of right* to all Appellants within its jurisdiction.

There are remedies indeed for all colonial evils; and surely we are not so base a people as willingly to sit down in despair under corruptions that admit of cure. The monuments of art springing up all about us, and the astonishing results of our mercantile industry and mechanical ingenuity, and the heroism of our seamen and soldiers, are not the only wonders which are to do honour to our time. Our civil triumphs may and must be extended to our laws and administration abroad and at home. The debates of last year on New Zealand, proved that we have statesmen among us aware of existing evils; and the wise way to Colonial Reform now taken by Mr. Hume through the examination of our Colonial History, justifies a sanguine hope that a future is coming to us in which the lessons of that history, by its warnings so frightfully neglected, will produce for us and for all who are under our influence, peaceful and prosperous days.

* Lord Mahon's History, Vol. IV. p. 543.

Such happy results, however, cannot be secured without a searching inquiry into all that concerns our colonial administration; without securing to the home authorities a complete knowledge of colonial facts; nor, finally, without resorting to the good old English plan of calling into that administration, as legislators, those who are affected by public measures—in one word, without establishing *self-government* for our colonists; to the very utmost extent to which it can be carried, whilst colonies are connected with the mother country.

That great principle of *self government* abroad, introduced with its necessary limitations, is consistent with an institution for which we are now ripe at home;—namely, an institution to be formed, of colonial, Indian, and home members of high rank and extensive experience, analogous to a combination of the old plantation committees of the privy council; of the present colonial agents, and colonial associations; and of the French colonial delegates sitting in Paris. It would exceed the proper limits of this article to set forth the entire composition and attributes of this body; but if it were duly established, simultaneously with elective assemblies in *all* the colonies; and with the admission of a few colonial members into the House of Commons, it would go far to settle all colonial difficulties, and to place this country in the position it ought to occupy.

The scheme of such a colonial council in London, is ably described by Mr. Porter, in the *Progress of the Nation*, vol. iii. p. 317.

The arguments in favour of colonial members in the House of Commons, were originally stated by Baron Maseres, in 1776. They have lately been forcibly urged in a pamphlet by Mr. Thomas Bannister, of the Temple.

Measures like these, will make our colonies one with us; and call forth from the whole empire, its best strength for the general good. They will also save us from new losses, such as those of the thirteen American colonies, seventy years ago—from the mortification of being expelled from Canada, or excluded from Oregon by the superiority of our neighbours in a great art of statesmanship—colonization. They would extinguish such bloody migrations as those of South Africa in the last twelve years, such wars as those of West Africa, and that of New Zealand,—and the more disgraceful, unceasing massacres throughout the Australias,—all attributable to what Sir Thomas Fowell Buxton too mildly stigmatised as the '*Chapter of Accidents*,' of the colonial office.

What this vast colonial empire really is, may be seen to some extent from a paper printed last year by the House of Commons

on the motion of Mr. Hume,* which shews our forty-one colonies to have a population of four million, six hundred and seventy-four thousand, three hundred and thirty-three souls; to have exports and imports worth £27,400,000 sterling; and to employ 5865 ships, of 1,171,762 tons burthen, being *double that of all France*.

These figures do not include India or China,—nor do they extend to the millions of coloured people, who are really dependent on our policy in every quarter of the globe.

The army, navy, and ordnance estimates, shew the distribution of our soldiers and sailors throughout the colonies. The papers of the Geographical Society trace the progress of our science; whilst the wider and more important influence of Christian civilization is marked by the missionary stations.

On the head of geography, very much remains to be done for the colonies. Such maps as the excellent *Colonial Chart*, and the still more useful collection of missionary maps, published by Mr. Wyld, of Charing Cross, ought to be distributed largely by the government throughout all the colonies, and at home, as *school books*. Great efforts are making by particular individuals to advance the means of geographical knowledge; but they must fail, if not supported vigorously by government. The ancients placed maps on a vast scale upon the walls of their temples and colleges, to teach the people, and especially the young. A map of the old world, five feet in diameter, was exposed for centuries as an altar-piece of the cathedral at Hereford. A map, by the famous Cabot's own hand, was long to be seen on the walls of the old palace at Whitehall.

The elements of such *instruction by the eye* are most abundantly at our command. Not to mention Cook's South-Sea treasures in the British Museum, and similar treasures in all Missionary and United Service Museums, we have had recent proof of the extent of such resources, in the invaluable collections of Dr. Andrew Smith, for South Africa; of Mr. Catlin, for the Indians of North American; of Mr. Dunn, for China; and of Mr. Angas, for New Zealand and Australia, now exhibiting at the Egyptian Hall in Piccadilly; and well deserving the attention of all classes. The frequenting of these exhibitions is a good sign of the interest taken by the public in the subject of them,—the savage whom we are fast destroying. It may be hoped that means will one day be devised for preserving them at national institutions, after they have ceased to gratify more curiosity.

* House of Commons Papers, 1845.—No. 49.

Art. V.—*The Age of Pitt and Fox.* By the Author of 'Ireland and its Rulers.' In 3 volumes. Vol. I. 8vo. London: T. C. Newby, 1846.

Few periods of our history are more interesting or instructive than that embraced in the work before us. It is sufficiently distant for us to judge of its actors and events with a good degree of impartiality, and yet near enough to engage our sympathies, and to exercise the influence of present and living interests. Some other periods are invested with deeper importance, and present specimens of our common nature, of a higher and nobler mould. This is pre-eminently the case with the times of the Long Parliament and the Commonwealth; but that era stands apart from all others in our history, having qualities of its own which eschew comparison, and for the most part stand out in contrast, with all which preceded or have followed. The age of Pitt and Fox has a distinctive interest, which is greatly derived from the character of its chief actors, and the crisis it constituted in the history of parties. Their talents were singularly varied, yet of the highest order, and their personal history had few points in common. The son of the Earl of Chatham, ending his career as the idol of the Tories and the sworn enemy of reform; Charles James Fox ejected from the North administration, and becoming the eloquent champion of popular rights; whilst Edmund Burke, in some respects superior to both, renouncing his earlier position and friendships, entered into alliances as hostile to his reputation as they were injurious to the progress of liberty throughout Europe. In the contests of that day, however, the highest element of statesmanship is wanted. It is but occasionally that we meet with the nobler spirit which so frequently appeared in the Long Parliament, where the personal was merged in the public, the partisan in the patriot, where an honest consecration to the welfare of the many became the rule, and constituted the end of senatorial labours. Personal ambition, or party feuds, make up for the most part the history. It is a gladiatorial scene which we witness,—the struggles of faction rather than of principle, the vehemence and passion of selfish combatants, rather than the cooperation of enlightened intellects to work out the salvation of nations.

No illusion can be more perfect than that which has been practised on the young intellect of England. To dispel it is no grateful task, but to do so is absolutely needful in order that the true lesson of history should be learnt. We have been accustomed to connect great names with immortal principles, and our admiration of the latter has been associated, by a natural

law, with the former. There was little, however, in the spirit and inward purposes of the men to warrant this. They were of the earth, earthy, with views as secular and selfish as the other politicians by whom they were surrounded. Burke was probably one of the purest of his class, but his passions were too vehement, and his judgments too treacherous and hasty, to allow of his being regarded with the confiding admiration which is inspired by the highest class of statesmen. Whilst we listen to the splendid oratory of Fox, unrivalled in his powers of debate, we unconsciously worship the speaker as the anointed oracle of truth. But a moment's reflection and our worship ceases. There is nothing to sustain our faith. The evidences of deep earnestness are wanting, even the ordinary and outward marks of consistency are absent. The actor is more visible than the man. The party leader rather than the self-sacrificing patriot is the image which remains before the mind. The elements of moral greatness were wanting, and his life, therefore, notwithstanding his splendid powers, failed to accomplish its proper vocation. A gambler and a debauchee, he failed to carry along with him the confiding trust of the popular mind, by which alone he could hope to make way against the stolid obstinacy of the king, and the violent prejudices of an ignorant and besotted squirearchy. Thus it has ever been in English history, and though in particular cases we may regret the result, we do not, on the whole, wish it were otherwise. Despotie ministers may work out their designs whatever be their character, but the advocates of popular freedom can triumph only by transparent integrity and deep earnestness. These are the elements of their power, without which they will be like Samson shorn of his strength. It would be easy to name living senators of liberal views, and of more than average talent, who yet fail to make any impression on the country, because there is no faith in the deep seriousness of their advocacy. It was so with Fox and his associates, though the fascination of his manners, the splendour of his gifts, and the fearful tragedies which marked the period of his public life, gave him, probably, greater power than was ever possessed by any other popular statesman similarly constituted. What might have been the result had he associated the elements of moral with those of intellectual greatness, it is not for us to say. We have our opinion on this point, and when occasion requires shall be free to express it.

The work which has given occasion to these remarks—of which the first volume only has yet appeared—is the production of a clever man, completely acquainted with the times described. It is somewhat too sketchy for our taste, and is deficient in what,

for want of a better name, we will term the philosophy of the subject. The standard of public morality applied is, moreover, in some cases exceedingly lax, and the style is loose and inaccurate. Yet, notwithstanding these drawbacks, the work is both attractive and useful. It may be read with advantage by all classes, and may serve as a good introduction to the history of the last quarter of the eighteenth century. The period embraced is that which intervened between the close of the American and the commencement of the Peninsular war; and the objects kept in view throughout, and which it is designed to illustrate, are; the nature of the English government, in practice, as distinguished from the technical constitution of law books; the characters and principles of the illustrious men who presided over English affairs; the influence of the French Revolution; and the legislative independence of Ireland. The present volume embraces only a very brief period, and commences with the fall of Lord North's administration in March, 1782. The immediate occasion of this event was the disasters of the American war, which had gradually increased the Whig minorities, until they became too powerful to allow the court favourite longer to retain office. From the year 1775, upwards of one hundred millions had been expended, thirteen colonies, besides several West India and other islands had been lost, and an exhausting war with America, France, Spain, and Holland, was being waged. It was, therefore, obviously quite time, that the obstinacy of the king should be overruled by the popular branch of the legislature, and the minister who had servilely lent himself to the crown should be driven from office.

The party which succeeded was that of the Whigs, and no slight difficulty was experienced in inducing the monarch to recall them to his councils. Nothing but the necessity of the case overcame his reluctance, and, as we shall presently see, he retained them no longer than that necessity lasted. The part acted by the Whigs in 1688 had placed them in a commanding position, and given them a long tenure of office; occasionally, indeed, interrupted in its earlier period, but ultimately settling down to something like a monopoly of civil trusts and emoluments. A knowledge of this fact is essential to an accurate estimate of English history from the period of the Revolution to the accession of George III. The following extract will aid the intelligent reader, in tracing out the threads of a narrative, which exhibits both the glory and the weakness of Whiggism.

'The Whig party had acquired great historical lustre by their overthrow of the Stuarts in the seventeenth century. They had ori-

ginated the Revolution of 1688: their schemes were sanctioned by the Tories, and that great historical event had been accomplished by the union of both parties. But the burthen of maintaining the Revolution was thrown upon the Whigs. The adherents of the exiled family were formidable in number and influence, and down to the period of 1748, it was not impossible for enterprising statesmen to have effected a counter-revolution. Many of the Tories aided the Jacobites, and the fear of 'Popery' alone deterred a large portion of the nation from championing the ancient Dynasty. In addition to the difficulty of supporting a new family upon the throne, the Whigs were embarrassed by the characters of the two first Georges. They had no qualities of insinuation, and were in many respects unsuited for England; they were formal and pedantic in their notions, and did not properly feel their glory as British kings. On the other hand, the rashness and incapacity of the Stuart Pretenders dispirited the Tories, and nullified their schemes. And from the landing of King William at Torbay, in 1688, down to the Treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle, in 1748, the success of the Revolution wavered, and the great cause of rational and constitutional liberty would have been lost, but for the skill and happy sagacity of Sir Robert Walpole. Thus the services which the Whigs had rendered to the monarchy, gave them a claim to the respect and confidence of the king; but like all political parties they stretched their claims too far, and they evidently thought that the Revolution of 1688 had destroyed the prerogative of the sovereign to rule without responsible advisers, but had also created a privilege for the Whigs to advise the crown in perpetuity.'—vol. i. pp. 7, 8.

Such was the political state of this party when George III. ascended the throne in 1760. The young king, then in his twenty-third year, determined to break through the restraints under which his predecessors had been held, and to assert for the crown, the right reserved to it by the constitution, of choosing its own advisers. His early associates had been opposed to the interests of the Whigs, whose haughty bearing and neglect of the genius and business capacity of 'new men' contributed much to the success of his policy. 'The great revolution families' were astonished at the temerity of the monarch. Their long possession of office had engendered the notion of its being their right. They constituted an oligarchy, popular in their theory, but despotic and corrupt in their rule; overshadowing the throne only to divide amongst themselves the spoils of the state. To their dictation the young monarch refused to submit, and on this point he was clearly right. The great mass of the community felt with him, and had his subsequent selection been wise, had the ministers chosen been men of large capacity and patriotic views, intent on the wise conduct of national affairs and the true interests of both king and people,

George III. would have been entitled to the lasting gratitude of his subjects. That this was not the case we need scarcely remark. Sufficient proof of the fact is furnished by the downfall of the North administration, under circumstances of peculiar ignominy, in 1782.

The cabinet which succeeded took its name from the Marquis of Rockingham, its nominal head. It was composed of two divisions, known as the Rockingham and the Shelburne Whigs, and all its chief offices, excepting the chancellorship, which the king insisted on Lord Thurlow retaining, were distributed amongst the aristocratic members of the party. The following sketch of the two sections which composed this administration, furnishes the secret of its short-lived existence. A house so divided was not likely to stand long against the determined hostility of the king.

‘ Lord Rockingham’s followers were what might be called the family compact Whigs—representing the principles of prescriptive Whiggery. Lord Shelburne’s faction had originally been formed by Lord Chatham, and affected to act independently of party ties—they were Whigs of progression, and stoutly combated the leading article of the Rockingham creed—‘that the great Revolution families should govern England.’ One party was an oligarchy with a historical fame, and confederated under hereditary leaders;—its Russells—Cavendishes—and Bentincks, and a swarm of minor Whig families being all bound together by ancient recollections—habitual intercourse—and family alliances. They formed a vast junto, of great ambition and prodigious power. Their politics had been elaborately digested into a system by the genius of Burke, who gave them a political code, and who furnished them with a variety of maxims, and general principles so happily expressed as to seem suited for the Rockingham creed alone. They were ready to defend the theory of monarchy, and were desirous of keeping the sovereign their creature. They were eager to espouse the popular cause, provided the people were ready to remain their clients. They wished to introduce into political life, new men of genius, who were to exhibit their talents, adorn the party, but should not aspire to sitting in the Cabinet.

‘ The Shelburne party, on the other hand, cherished the tenets of Whiggery, but it applied them after a different fashion from the Rockingham school. They thought that England should be governed by a much larger and even more formidable junto than the great Revolution families; they cordially acknowledged the existence of a power, which was only superciliously recognized by the Rockingham Whigs; in short, the Shelburne party thought that the true idea of the Revolution of 1688, was that the English public should govern, and not a collection of great families. The supporters of the Shelburne system distinguished between a public and a populace, as they dis-

criminated between a Whig party, and a faction of families. Laughing at the divine right of kings, they spurned the principle that the Dukes of Bedford and Devonshire should parcel out the empire between them. They thought that the king had a right to choose his ministers from the host of public men in parliament, and they boldly claimed the right of men of commanding talent to sit in the cabinet, even though fortune had not given them ancestors, 'who (in the graceful catchwords of the Rockinghams) had bled with Hampden in the field, or died with Sydney on the scaffold.' They went to the king's closet, as his ministers; they did not comport themselves as his masters, or demean themselves (like Lord North and his colleagues) as if they were his servants. A manly sovereign would not be thrown upon his metal by the Shelburne system of politics, nor would a despotic monarch select his tools from men bred in that school. To both king and people their conduct was more truly respectful than that of the Rockingham party.'—*Ib.* pp. 21—23.

Charles James Fox, then 'in the flush of his popularity, and political fame,' was one of the secretaries of state, whilst Edmund Burke, infinitely his superior in morals, and inferior to none of his contemporaries in the gigantic splendours of his intellect, was assigned only the subordinate office of paymaster of the forces. The one was the son of Lord Holland, the other an Irish gentleman of slender means and of no family influence, and in this fact the secret of their disproportionate reward is found.

'Were a man in this country,' remarks the most recent biographer of Burke, 'of great capacity and attainments, though of little influence or fortune, such for instance as Mr. Burke himself was, deliberately to choose his side in politics as he would a profession—that is, for the advantages it is likely to bring—he would, probably, not be a Whig. That numerous and powerful body is believed to be too tenacious of official consequence to part with it to talents alone, and too prone to consider high rank, leading influence, and great family connexion, rather than abilities of humble birth, as of right entitled to the first offices of government. They are willing, indeed, to grant emolument, but not to grant power, to any other than lawyers, who do not materially interfere with their views on the chief departments of government; an opinion which, notwithstanding the profession of popular principles, is believed to have made them sometimes unpopular in the great market of public talent, and to have driven many useful allies into the ranks of the Tories.*

Both Fox and Burke belonged to the Rockingham faction, and the *Correspondence* of the latter, recently published, clearly reveals the want of harmony and consequent lack of con-

* Prior, p. 233.

fidence, amongst the leaders of the administration. The death of Lord Rockingham, which occurred in the following July, led to the premiership of Lord Shelburne, under whom both Fox and Burke declined to serve. Several members, however, of the former cabinet remained in office, and considerable business talent was secured in the adhesion of William Pitt, who held the chancellorship of the exchequer, and was loud in his profession of reform principles. It will be remembered that Lord Shelburne's was the most popular section of the Whig party. They were in fact the movement party of their day, the Whig-radical division of the liberal host. Yet to this party did the second William Pitt belong, the man whose name was speedily to become the terror of the friends of liberty, and the confidence and hope of despotism, throughout Europe. Such are the changes which we witness in the course of human affairs—

Tempora mutantur
Et nos cum illis mutamur.

In this respect the future prime minister of George III., who was to lead the crusade against European freedom, was greatly in advance of Burke, by whose timely conversion his nefarious designs were to be so powerfully aided. The reformers of the period before us, like those of most other days, were of two kinds, of whom Lord Shelburne and John Wilkes may be taken as types. The former headed the party which represented the views of Lord Chatham, who, in moving an address to the king, in 1770, expressed the opinion that 'an additional number of knights of the shire ought to be added as a balance against the weight of several corrupt and venal boroughs, which, perhaps,' he remarked, 'could not be lopped off entirely without the hazard of a public convulsion!' Wilkes, on the other hand, felt no scruple, and observed no limits. Headstrong, selfish, and venal, he viewed everything in reference to his own base interests, acting the bully, or the hypocrite, just as he deemed it most likely to advance his sinister designs. The blunders of his enemies gave him great advantage by which he was not slow to profit, but the fame and the influence of the demagogue is necessarily brief, and Wilkes lived to inherit the contempt and neglect which he so well merited. Our author has gone out of his way to indulge in much loose declamation—we might use a more significant term—purporting to be a description of the Radical Reform Class of the past fifty years. There is an irritability and want of discrimination in his allusions to this class for which it would be difficult to account, were it not customary with writers who can palliate the dishonesty of Charles James Fox, in signing, as is alleged, his name in favour

of vote by ballot, annual parliaments, and other sweeping changes, 'merely from a careless desire of humouring the popular party,' to throw suspicion on the motives and to impeach the conduct of the more upright and consistent friends of liberty. We give the following as a sample, simply cautioning our readers against estimating the writer's impartiality, or judgment, by it. The good taste it evinces is on a par with its discrimination.

'To the exertions of Wilkes and Tooke, aided by the licence of the London rabble, is to be traced the birth of that spirit of false democracy, which under various names duped thousands; and disturbed English society for the succeeding sixty years. One picture of the tribunes of that licentious party answers for their character and purposes at all periods of their history. What knaves! what slanderers of England and its institutions! and side by side with the charlatans and adventurers, what vain and futile theorists, imbecile in devising good, influential in aggravating evils! The aristocratic gambler, driven to politics from his craving for excitement; the notorious profligate, declaiming in favour of political purity; the vain dreamer, the fantastic schemer, the puerile theorist, seeking food for their vanity in public notoriety, or hoping by popular connexions to impart strength to their weak abilities: such are the leaders who periodically return for the disturbance and delusion of the untaught and neglected masses, who smoulder in the purlieus of our great towns. With them are mixed, perchance, some antiquarian dotard, who sees perfection in the parchment constitutions of former ages. His honest folly contrasts with the coarse ambition of the bloated aldermen seeking to buy popular applause at so much *per* shout. And hearken to yon briefless barrister, advertising his fluency of vituperation, while 'hear hims' are cried by the quack, who has risen into bad eminence by calumniating the faculty, or by the clergyman, whose vices have deprived him of his parish! Such are the prominent figures of that grovelling school of reform, founded by Wilkes and Horne Tooke, and continued to later generations, by their equally vicious, but far more contemptible successors. For in truth the polluted characters of the tribunes of the British populace did more for half a century to retard the growth of a true public spirit, and to confirm the power of an oligarchy, than the government of Mr. Pitt, or the eloquence of Mr. Canning, to strengthen and uphold the borough system. It was the lives of the leaders, and not the purposes of their party, which for so many years made Radical a synonyme for rascal. And of all the deceivers of the multitude, none were more worthy of grave censure than the aristocratic libertines, who laughed in their orgies over the success of their efforts in popular delusion.'—*Ib.* p. 72—74.

That there were bad men then, as now, we doubt not—men who traded in patriotism and laughed at the confidence they in-

spired; but that this was the case with the majority, or even with a large proportion, of those who thought or acted for the people, at the eventful period referred to, we unhesitatingly deny. In private morals, even the worst of this class scarcely sunk below Fox and Sheridan, whilst the great body of them were infinitely their superiors. But so it has ever been. The vices of the great are glossed over and forgotten, whilst those of the people are magnified and repeated *ad nauseam*. The only effectual cure for this is in the people having writers of their own. History has hitherto been in the hands of the aristocracy, and it has told only a one-sided tale. Let us have fair play, and we shrink not from the comparison. We can scarcely refrain from smiling when we read such rigmarole as the following. A man must have large confidence in the ignorance, or gullibility of his readers, to have penned it.

‘But though the representative system required reform, its evils were exaggerated. This was found to be the case when men began to reason about the remedy. A large park—a small mound of earth—a castle in ruins—were severally represented by a pair of members, but large towns had no spokesmen in the House of Commons. That was the evil; yet what was to be the remedy? Was England to be placed under the tyranny of a multitudinous constituency? Was the country to be cut up into rectangular districts, and the number of the population taken as the standard of elective right? To these questions the common sense of the country answered in the negative. Many thought, not unreasonably, that the rotten boroughs had their advantages. Men of talent; lawyers of character and political promise; country gentlemen of public spirit greater than their private fortunes; intelligent merchants, who had no local connexions, and whose probity recoiled from the purchase of a few hundred pauper-electors; men of leisure and refined habits, averse to the electioneering chicane, tumult, and obloquy attendant on large constituencies: these various classes of men were enabled to enter public life through rotten boroughs, and to preserve their mental independence free from degrading bondage to popular fanaticism.’—*Ib.* p. 75.

The same want of discrimination and candour is visible in our author’s allusions to the American colonies. A blind and unheeding attachment to things ‘as they are,’ leads him to misapprehend the character of the colonists, and to attribute to them qualities of which they were wholly destitute. This is the more discreditable as sufficient time for reflection has been allowed, and candid men of all parties are now united in opinion, that if ever a justification of resistance was made out, it existed clearly in the case of the American States. If our author’s theory is to be admitted, the loss of our American colonies is another of the obligations conferred upon us by our

Established Church. No forethought, or forbearance, would have sufficed to prevent the catastrophe. The infatuation of successive cabinets was not requisite, nor the palpable violation of guaranteed rights required. The same result must have ensued, though at a period somewhat more remote, from the operation of causes inherent in 'the dissenting and puritanical spirit' prevalent amongst the colonies. The following brief passage explains our author's theory and does discredit to his understanding.

'In losing the American colonies, England had to bear that which was certain to occur. For there were many reasons why the American colonists must, in the course of things, have revolted from the mother country. A dissenting and puritanical spirit swayed their minds, and influenced their manners. They left England sour and discontented, and absence from the mother country did not soften their angry feelings. Their religion and politics were equally adverse to all submission of mind and opinion, and they were not satisfied with merely dissenting, but they were fanatically anxious to force their neighbours into their way of thinking. Their manners partook of their religion. Rigid and severe, they had no community of feeling with the social ideas of the English people. Those things which have drawn forth the love and veneration of the English nation were never regarded by them with attachment and pride. In short, there was no moral union between England and the colonies. Thus their separation was certain to occur, inasmuch as the colonists inherited the energy and perseverance of the Anglo-Saxon race.'—*Ib.* p. 128.

We turn from these exceptionable matters to pursue the course of the history. Lord Shelburne's administration was assailed by the united forces of Lord North and of Mr. Fox. The opposition of the former was natural, that of the latter factious and selfish. The Tory minister was to be calculated on as an opponent, but the hostility of the popular leader served to bring his own sincerity into doubt, and to induce the belief that his public life was swayed by personal ambition and spleen, rather than by an enlightened regard to the national welfare. He had frequently denounced Lord North as an incapable and vicious minister, 'the most infamous of mankind,' 'as the great criminal of the state, whose blood must expiate the calamities he had brought upon his country:' 'a man with whom, if he should ever act, he would be content to be thought for ever infamous.' With such a man, unchanged in spirit and principles, were Fox and his Whig associates content to enter into a league offensive and defensive. Over the base recklessness of the procedure, he attempted to throw the veil of a generous forgiveness.' 'It is neither wise nor noble,' he said in his defence, 'to keep up animosities for ever. It is neither just

nor candid to keep up animosity, when the cause of it is no more. It is not my nature to bear malice, or to live in ill-will. My friendships are perpetual, my enmities are not so.' The public, however, were not misled. They saw through the sophism, and, as Mr. Wilberforce remarked, expected from the unnatural coalition 'a progeny stamped with the features of both parents, the violence of the one party, and the corruption of the other.' The coalition which ensued was the great blot on the public reputation of Fox, and did more than any other event to damage, at a subsequent period, his nobler efforts against the military crusade, which the monarch commanded, and William Pitt preached. On the meeting of parliament, in December 1782, it was computed that Fox numbered about ninety followers, Lord North one hundred and twenty, and the minister one hundred and forty, the rest being unattached. In an early division Lord North voted with the ministers, and Mr. Fox was left in a small minority. This lesson was not without its effect, and what followed is thus recorded.

'But in the ensuing January fresh endeavours were made to bring Fox and North together. Some of the partizans of the former were most anxious that such a junction should take place. Seeing that Fox was in a small minority, Burke approved of the junction. So far as he was concerned, there was not very much inconsistency in allying himself with Lord North. They were both opposed to parliamentary reform, and Burke adhered to aristocratic opinions, while Fox avowedly committed himself to popular principles. And in the actual state of the case, Burke thought every attempt should be made to crush Lord Shelburne. He thought that the minister would prove the mere creature of the sovereign, and that a party should be formed for taking the practical management of the public affairs out of the hands of King George and his creatures. He favoured, therefore, the idea of the coalition. Such was not the case with Richard Brinsley Sheridan, who was just at that time rising into political eminence. He strongly disapproved of the idea. Remarkably shrewd, with great common sense, and leading a life which brought him into contact with various classes of society, he was well calculated for a barometer of the political atmosphere. He had great knowledge of effect, and he perceived that the proposed junction would not satisfy the public. He strenuously dissuaded Fox from thinking of it. But Lord John Townshend, one of the wits and ornaments of the Foxite party, took great pains to accomplish it. Lord Loughborough also approved of the proposition. By joining with North, Fox would gain numbers to his standard, and on the elevation of Lord North to the Upper House, upon old Lord Guildford's death, Fox would be the recognized leader of a host of members in the Lower House. On the other hand, by junction with Fox, who was so popular, Lord North would be relieved from the odium under

which he laboured. Such was the manner in which the coalitionists reasoned.'—*Ib.* pp. 132—134.

Prior maintains that Burke was a reluctant party to the coalition, strongly objecting to it at first, and yielding eventually only in compliance with the earnest solicitations of Fox. No evidence of this, however, is adduced, and the presumption of the case is opposed to it. In his *Correspondence* it is referred to in the genuine spirit of party tactics, and with a morality of which in other matters he would have been ashamed. Speaking of his party, he says, and this appears to have been deemed a sufficient vindication. 'Without that junction, they could have no chance of coming in at all.'* On the 17th of February, 1783, the two statesmen occupied the same bench, and their followers spoke and voted as one party. The minister was, consequently, left in successive minorities, and immediately resigned. What followed is thus described.

'The king was in great embarrassment. He saw nothing but a prospect of humiliation, and struggled hard against what he looked on as a disgrace. He tried to make a ministry through Earl Gower; and next, he tried with the Duke of Portland and Lord North, on condition that Thurlow should remain Chancellor, to which Fox would not consent; and he then tendered the Treasury to Pitt. Never was a more dazzling offer made to a young man; never was a tempting honour more judiciously declined. Pitt, though naturally elated by the brilliant compliment, thought that he would have to fight the coalition at great disadvantage, from the course pursued by Lord Shelburne in resigning. For it was one thing to resist the confederacy without succumbing, and it was quite another thing to oppose it as a minister after the rapid fall of Shelburne. With wary sagacity he resolved to bide his time.

'Again the king had recourse to Lord North, who at once declared that he could do nothing without his ally. The king disliked Fox more than ever, as he had displayed such audacity in making the coalition. The insulting language with which in former years Fox had spoken of his character, might have been pardoned to the licence of a young orator, but how could a manly sovereign endure such domineering authority as that with which Fox menaced him? The audacity of Fox's purpose, more than the violence of his language, roused King George to make every effort to secure his independence. But it was in vain. Shelburne had not the required firmness to deliver his king; Lord North was pledged to Fox. Again on the 24th of March, the king for the second time implored Pitt to become first minister, but Pitt firmly declined. And thus the king, on the 5th of April, 1783, was compelled to receive the Duke of Portland, the nominee of Charles Fox, as first lord of the treasury.'—*Ib.* pp. 156, 159.

* Burke's *Correspondence*, iii. 14.

Thus was formed the celebrated coalition ministry, which did more to damage the reputation of public men than any event since the pension and peerage of the elder Pitt. 'From the moment,' says Bishop Watson, 'this coalition was formed, I lost all confidence in public men. In the Foxite Whigs coalescing with the Tories to turn out Lord Shelburne, they destroyed my opinion of their disinterestedness and integrity. I clearly saw, that they sacrificed their public principles to private intrigue, and their honour to ambition.'

But one feeling prevailed throughout the nation. Men of all classes, and of every shade of opinion, were disgusted, and it was not long before the popular leader saw that he had lost his way. His support of Mr. Pitt's annual motion on reform, which was opposed by Lord North, failed to recover his popularity; and when, on the discussions respecting the Indian bill, the personal views of the monarch were used to influence the votes of the Upper House, he failed of the support which alone would have sustained him against the influence of the court. On the 18th of December, the two ministers were dismissed without the ceremony of a personal interview. Their talents and parliamentary strength availed them nothing against the king, for the country acquiesced in their defeat, and did not conceal its satisfaction at the due punishment of their selfish and tortuous policy. An important lesson is taught by this passage of our parliamentary history, and we trust that our own times will bear it in mind. In public, as in private life, 'honesty is the best policy!' An opposite course may answer a temporary purpose, but woe be to the statesman who relies upon it for permanent reputation or profit. Fox never recovered from the injury it inflicted. It revealed the weakness of his character, and was an insuperable barrier to the confidence which he afterwards solicited, and by which he might possibly have defeated the despotic policy of his opponent.

William Pitt was immediately created First Lord of the Treasury, and Chancellor of the Exchequer, and might well have been daunted by the imposing array against him.

'The Foxites could scarcely believe Pitt serious in his intention of encountering them. On the 17th, Fox had delivered a stirring invective against Pitt and his party. 'What man,' cried he, 'who has the feelings, the honour, the spirit, or the heart of a man, would, for any official dignity or emoluments whatever, stoop to such a condition, as that which the honourable gentleman (Pitt) proposes to occupy. Boys, without judgment, experience of the sentiments, suggested by a knowledge of the world, or the amiable decencies of a sound mind, may follow the headlong course of administration thus precipitately, and vault into the seat while the reins of government are placed in other hands, but the minister who can bear to act such

a dishonourable part, and the country that suffers it, will be mutual plagues and curses to each other.'—*Ib.* pp. 193, 194.

The young premier, however, was equal to the occasion, and though left in a minority on various divisions, was sustained by the confidence of the king and the nation. To the policy of William Pitt we need not express our hostility. It was founded on apostacy, gathered strength under the shadow of the prerogative, and would probably have succeeded amongst any other people in extinguishing the love of freedom. Inveterately hostile to liberty, it constituted the rallying point and the hope of the whole family of European despots, whilst to our own country it was productive of a thousand evils still bitterly felt amongst us. At first unassuming and moderate, it afterwards proceeded with giant's strides, making fear its rule, and arbitrary power the object of its worship. It would betoken little candour, however, if we did not admit the ability, fortitude, and skill, with which he addressed himself to his mission. His adversary had placed himself in a false position, and was, consequently, exposed without defence, or shelter, to the raking fire directed against him. Hated by the king, and mistrusted by the people, Fox had no hope but in his present parliamentary majority, and that was hourly threatened by the prospect of a dissolution. The feeling of the country—though not probably in its full extent—was known to both Fox and Pitt, and the confidence of the latter in the result of a general election, encouraged him to persevere notwithstanding the successive defeats he encountered. Fourteen divisions occurred between the 12th of January and the 8th of March, the dates and numbers of which were as follows:—

January 12th.	232	to	193	majority	39
—	196	to	142	ditto	54
16th.	205	to	184	ditto	21
23rd.	222	to	214	ditto	8
February 2nd.	223	to	204	ditto	19
3rd.	211	to	187	ditto	24
16th.	186	to	157	ditto	29
18th.	208	to	196	ditto	12
20th.	197	to	177	ditto	20
—	177	to	156	ditto	21
27th.	175	to	168	ditto	7
March 1st.	201	to	189	ditto	12
5th.	171	to	162	ditto	9
8th.	191	to	190	ditto	1

Ib. p. 225.

The last of these divisions was the final victory of the coalition. Parliament was dissolved, and the general election of 1784, gave a large majority to the king.

The events which followed, and the altered phases of party shall be noticed on the appearance of the subsequent volumes of this work. In the mean time, and notwithstanding the exceptions we have taken, we thank the author for his labours, and commend his volume to the candid examination of our readers.

Art. VI.—*Recollections of a Tour. A Summer Ramble in Belgium, Germany, and Switzerland.* By J. W. Massie, D. D., M. R. S. A. London: Snow, 1846.

THE long duration of peace between this country and the continent, has been highly beneficial in promoting a kindly interchange of visits. National animosities have subsided, and confidence has been partly restored. Numerous circumstances have concurred to facilitate, and render popular, an intercourse with our continental neighbours. Science has contributed her aid to diminish the time and expense necessary;—literature has imparted the light of her 'guides,'—and fashion has thrown her charm over a continental ramble. Under these circumstances, information has been eagerly sought, by our countrymen, and the supply has grown with the demand. Our author does full justice to his predecessors without servilely following in their track. He marks out for himself, a distinct line, in which his success is highly creditable.

“‘I would pursue,’ he says ‘the path they have trod, while I claim some distinction from them in the principles of our creed, and the moral tendency of our observations. I meant from the first to indicate how the scenes and associations *strike a Christian*. I was also solicitous to accumulate local and historical information, rather than poetical descants, or theological disquisitions. I have therefore corrected, as well as recollected; investigated, as well as surveyed; and collected, as well as recited, the traditions and legends of those famed regions. Yet, had I contemplated enquiries so elaborate and diversified as have followed, I should have shrunk from the task, and doubted the wisdom of such an undertaking.’”—p. vi.

Every reader will respect the manly frankness, with which Dr. Massie, at the beginning of his work, has avowed his principles as *a Christian*. He has throughout the volume maintained a consistent adherence to these principles, particularly in investigating some of the prevalent traditions and legends, and in exposing their absurdity, and the wickedness of using them as the instruments of mercenary and subtle priestcraft. The

love of *the truth* is impressed on every page. To confirm the veritable statements of preceding writers, to correct errors which have been believed, and to expose to merited disgrace delusions which have been maintained, are objects constantly kept in view. While many publications which have lately issued from the press, will soon pass into oblivion, the work before us has elements of enduring interest which render it worthy of prolonged remembrance. It is replete with sound information and instruction. By the casual reader it will be approved, and by the student it will be prized. It is a work, apart from all adventitious considerations, possessing much merit, exhibiting in a favourable light the quickness of discrimination, practical judgment, and historical knowledge of the author. He has presented the facts which occurred in the towns and cities, through which he passed, with a vividness of description admirably adapted to make a strong impression on his readers. Of this class is the description of Ghent,—a place of deep interest to the lovers of history, as being the birth-place of Charles the Fifth.

‘ It stands on the Scheldt, which there receives as tributaries the Lieve, the Lys, and the More ; whose connexion is completed by several navigable canals. Twenty-six clustering islands are here united by as many as a hundred bridges, as the locality of one city, occupied by 10,000 houses and 30,000 inhabitants. In the thirteenth century it was one of the largest cities in Europe. The circuit of it was double the dimensions of Bruges, and was, in the opinion of many, the best situated for commerce in the midst of the richest and most beautiful part of Flanders. According to Ludovico Guicciardini, it then contained 35,000 separate houses, and five inhabitants to each dwelling ; while its walls embraced a circumference of 45,640 Roman feet—which no doubt included many open spaces, whether for gardens or squares. The magistrates of Ghent were then most minute in their fiscal surveillance, and exacted a revenue from every loom. The number of its weaving population is said at one time to have exceeded 40,000. The incorporation of weavers could then, on an emergency, call into the field 18,000 men as soldiers, whose weapons were always accessible. The impress on the general population of Ghent, I think, may be traced to the influence of this body, and evinced much of what I believe to be the characteristic features of the weaver trade in almost all countries. They were a thinking, reasoning, disputatious, and opinionated people, refusing to let go what they deemed to be advantages to please any, even men of exalted rank and power. A consequence of this tenacious habit was, that they and their fellow-citizens had often broils and squabbles with the petty princes that professed to rule them. It moreover happened, that sometimes this turbulent, self-willed, and imperious spirit precipitated them into conflict with stronger powers

than themselves, who, with inexorable revenge, delighted to humble them to the attitude of suppliants, and bring them upon their knees imploring pardon, even with a halter round their necks, to add to the indignity.'—p. 19.

Dr. Massie visited other manufacturing towns; and as the result of his observations, shows the impolitic effects of our *protective* system in producing continental rivalry. One remarkable illustration of this is found at Namur, where the old episcopal palace and its extensive grounds are turned into a vast hardware manufactory, giving to the town a resemblance to our Sheffield.

'Namur is to Belgium what Sheffield is to England: the cutlery of the Netherlands is made there. Seraigne, more like a street for continuousness than a town for architecture, nearly a mile in length, stretches along upon the river Meuse between Namur and Liege. An old episcopal residence, in which the prelatie princes of Liege resided in the times of feudal power and grandeur, was a few years ago turned into the vestibule and front section of a magnificent factory for casting and constructing machinery for almost every mechanical purpose; whether for peaceful arts, or as implements of destruction. The palatial gardens—no longer the luxurious retreat of lordly churchmen, but now made the storehouse or depository for crude and manufactured iron, and occupied with heaps of coal—have altogether lost their episcopal aspect; and, while yielding to the darkening and sombre influences of some fifty wide-mouth chimneys, and their issuing flames or smoke, the prelatie dignity of the scene may seem to have disappeared—but a no less intellectual and industrious destiny prevails. Ingenuity and patient labour here preside; while nearly every description of iron-work is fabricated, from the heaviest and most potent engine to the most complicated or refined instrument of utility—from the monumental lion which couches on the field of Waterloo, to the lady's penknife which is deposited in her reticule. The vast pile of buildings forms a town within itself. The establishment possesses a great advantage in being placed over the bed of coal from which its exhaustless supply is dug; and the fuel being raised within the limits of the factory, and close to the furnaces near to which the mineral ore is found, the labour is much diminished compared with many English foundries. The workshops of the craftsmen are situated upon the line of railways on the banks of canals leading to the river. The blast furnaces, puddling furnaces, forges, and rolling mills, are on the opposite bank of the river from the houses of the operatives; but they maintain their intercourse between home and the shop by boats provided for their convenience and at their command.

'John Cockerill, as a prince among mechanics, was in partnership (a strange association, and uncommon for the trader) with the late King of Holland, as an engine-builder and machine-maker, which gave celebrity to this large establishment. There have been, and I

presume there are still three thousand persons employed in these works, receiving on an average about £2000 in weekly wages. Cockerill sought to extend his connexions and mechanical fame, especially in regions where manufacturing skill was precious. He died at Warsaw, leaving his wealth to his heirs, and his name on many continental locomotives.'—p. 81.

The state of religion throughout vast tracts of the European continent, deeply affected our author. To a devout mind the moral condition of a people must ever be an object of more absorbing interest than the mechanical arts practised, or the natural beauties of the scenery around them. This was pre-eminently so with Dr. Massie. He mourned over the cities through which he passed, and has given his countrymen an affecting statement of the case, and made this statement the ground of an earnest appeal to their benevolent and generous feelings. He urges the appeal by considerations of consistency and economy. The proximity of the sphere of labour compared with the remoteness of other countries which Christians have sought to evangelize,—the immense population thus near,—and the few efforts British Christians have made for their benefit, are the reasons by which his appeal is sustained. He speaks of continued scenes of 'gross popery,' through which he passed. 'From the borders of Belgium to the further territorial confines of the French and Dutch, the people, with but few exceptions, are left to the forms and observances of the Roman-catholic church.'

'I do not,' he adds, 'expect the overthrow of so baneful a system till Britons, or Christians of other lands, those that feel the truth and love the truth, shall arise and avail themselves of the liberty of teaching and the liberty of association, which we find in Belgium; till Christian associations shall arise and go forth with all the pity that has been expended upon Tahiti and the other islands of the South. Tahiti, with its 10,000 inhabitants, has had twenty times the number of missionaries sent to it, that we have sent to Belgium with its 4,000,000 of people.'

'While we have in Belgium the liberty of teaching and of association, we pass over the ignorant and perishing multitudes that are near, who, when themselves enlightened and converted, might work with us in efforts of Christian benevolence; who might expend and consecrate energies and sanctified resources in promoting the same work, and in diffusing the blessings of Christian fellowship amidst the inhabitants of neighbouring lands. Instead of thus concentrating and accumulating our power to do good, we almost neglect the fields of proximate lands, and range the wide extremes of the world, casting our corn in handfuls on comparatively barren rocks. I would say nothing to disparage missionary work, but I would undertake missionary work at home, as well as abroad; I would undertake mis-

sionary work amongst the millions of continental nations, as I would undertake missionary work amongst the hundreds of the islands of the Southern Seas. It is the duty of Christians to seize the best means of extending their religion; and I say, let them extend it amongst the countries that are near them, with zeal and energy proportionate to their efforts amongst the countries that are remote.'—p. 102.

We hope this appeal will be followed by immediate and energetic efforts to send Christian truth, in its purity and simplicity, to the Belgians. For though, in Belgium, liberty for Christian teaching and association may be fully allowed, yet most of the governments of the continent are intolerant and persecuting to every form of religion except the one patronized by the state. And this intolerance has deterred Christians from making the Continent of Europe the sphere of their exertions. Germany, however, has furnished several zealous missionaries to the heathen.

The author evinces a generous sympathy with those who labour amidst privation and suffering, depending on the power of truth, and the zeal of its disciples, for the promotion of religion, rather than on the patronage of the state. There were many such scattered along his route, and he neglects no fair opportunity of doing them honour. In this respect he sets a worthy example, which we shall be glad to find extensively copied. Honourable mention is made of the Rev. Edmund Panchaud, pastor of the congregational church in Brussels, who has been eminently distinguished as an evangelical labourer in this unpromising field, and from whose church 'a body of pious and devoted associates, who love and co-operate with him, have been raised up to embark in the evangelization of Belgium.' It would afford us pleasure to quote extensively from these portions of the volume, but we are necessitated to confine ourselves to the following:—

'There is a little society of fervent and zealous Christians, who call their association the Belgian Evangelical Society; and they endeavour to extend the knowledge of the Gospel by means of missions of their own. They have, I think, as many as ten stations, with fourteen or more agents as preachers and teachers, etc., throughout Belgium; and the missionaries whom they employ are French, or those who can speak French; they have made only feeble attempts among the Walloons. The devoted men who are the chief staff of the Evangelical Society, are either Englishmen, or those that act in connection with an English community. The persons that are employed in the mission of the Evangelical Society for Belgium, have numerous assemblies, who congregate from time to time to hear the exposition of Divine truth. They preach the gospel sometimes in the midst of opposition, but oftener among a favourable audience,

with tokens of favour. They have converts from the Roman Catholic community; and these converts are frequently instances of the power and beauty of religion. They are, however, but as a handful of corn on the tops of the mountains: as yet a weak and despised few amongst a dense population.'—p. 42.

A well balanced and discriminating judgment is evinced by Dr. Massie in his estimate of Romanism. He is too liberal and tolerant to join in the 'No popery' cry of our political Protestants, at the same time that he is not afraid of the flippant and disreputable sneers with which some literary journals assail every honest effort to expose the real character of popery. There is much which calls for revision in the state of our periodical literature in this matter, and our author is entitled to praise for having fearlessly exposed the truth, notwithstanding the censure thereby hazarded from latitudinarian critics and temporising politicians. Dr. Massie is no alarmist. Whilst many others predict the rapid growth and gigantic sway of papal dominion, he discovers and clearly points out the traces of decay:—

'I was happy to perceive there was much less of the spirit of blood in the memorials of the Gothic church steeples, the watch-towers and castles of bygone times on this river than on the Rhine; whilst the ruins themselves rather betoken the advancement of society, the progress of mind and of liberty, since the classical associations of Ausonius, than the contests between feudal chiefs, or the aggressions of stronger nations. There is here little to excite the regrets of the tourist or the patriot. The ruins were generally the memorials of a system which is decaying, and passions which, no longer cherished, were often the fruit of superstition and caprice. Feudalism has been engulfed in the vortex of a wider dominion; and popular sympathies no longer respond to its assumptions. The larger sovereignties govern more diversified classes, and must minister to more various interests; and therefore must cultivate a more generic character. Nunneries, and institutions fostering celibacy, and ministering to morbid devotion and consecration, do not now people these banks as they once did, secluding amiable and accomplished womanhood from society, and inflicting a suicidal martyrdom upon the fairest portion of our race; destroying themselves, or absorbing their generous sympathies in dreams, vigils, and plaintive sighings, and depriving mankind of the active discharge of their most virtuous obligations. Many of these sepulchral cells, which had entombed the living victim, and robbed the age or generation of nature's best offerings, have been blown to atoms.

It is also a remarkable fact—I wonder it does not excite the attention of the observant catholic—the glory of papal architecture is *antique*; its most gorgeous fabrics are of *former* times: and while many of them are absolutely mouldering into dust, and others cannot

be kept in habitable repair, the prodigal liberality of the devotee is insufficient to rear structures which shall supply the place of those which wax old. The nests and hot-beds, the nurseries and cradles of its most precocious progeny, the nunneries and convents, leave their fragments as mausoleums for the shades of superstition; while abbeys and episcopal principalities, and the territorial power and dominions of electoral and palatine prelates, have been secularised, and transferred to the possession of other bodies. What wise man will mourn, when he looks on the ruins of a conventual establishment? What patriot will grieve to see the cotton-mill, the forge, or the implements of husbandry, occupying the palace of the warlike archbishop, or the plundering chieftain? The reflections thus expressed are but the suggestions of the scenes and recollections of the banks and sloping vineyards, the rich harvest-homes, and the manufactories on the Moselle. Here and there the remains of monastic life are traceable, only as discovering how the passion for it has subsided, and how much more active and diffusive are the habits of modern society, than were the practices of ecclesiastical and papal institutions.'—pp. 239—240.

Nothing that belonged to the religious condition of the people could escape the notice of our author. Alive to the spiritual welfare of mankind, he hailed the symptoms of coming deliverance from their present bondage. The movement, which during the last two years has agitated papal Germany, has more moral material to aid its progress, and secure its success, than its first actors imagined. The Governor of the universe had purposed that a more effective and glorious reformation should be accomplished, than the first agitators had contemplated. He sees the end from the beginning; and agents to effect his gracious purpose will be provided. This appears to be the case in the present politico-religious excitement of Germany. It is evidently in an incipient state of its progress; but its issue will be for the emancipation of human spirits from the thralldom of priestly domination.

Rongé was born at Bischofswald, in 1813. At an early age he kept his father's flock at the foot of the Giant Mountains. While thus engaged, he indulged his inclination to think on religion, a future life, and eternity. His 'Catechism' and his 'Bible History' were his constant companions. During nine years he was a scholar at the high school of Neisse, whence he passed to the university of Breslau. At the close of 1839, being then twenty-six years of age, and during his former life knowing but little of restraint, he became a candidate for the Roman Catholic priesthood. From that period, he felt the authority of his ecclesiastical superiors irksome and oppressive, and whilst groaning under his own burden, he shuddered at the thought of subjecting others to a misery which he found to be almost in-

tolerable. 'I murmured,' said he, 'that I should be myself a slave! Must I also be a tool to work the degradation of my fellow-men?' It cannot be matter of surprize, that a young man, naturally energetic, and of such sentiments, should show some signs of resistance and indignation, when commanded to pray, 'that the Spaniards may return to their old ecclesiastical bondage.' He met this papal injunction with the reply, 'It is, indeed, most necessary that we pray for ourselves and for the Spaniards, but it shall be for the freedom and independence of ourselves and them—in union with which alone can true religion and morality exist—and not for slavery and dependence, which can at best engender dissimulation and hypocrisy.'

In September, 1844, he wrote his letter to Arnoldi, Bishop of Treves, exposing the imposture of the *holy tunic*, and in December following, he received the sentence of his 'degradation and excommunication' from the pale of the Catholic church. By this brief sketch of Rongé's history, it will be evident that his dauntless attack upon the Roman Catholic church, chiefly originated in an abhorrence of the authority it assumed over the civil liberties and consciences of men. But other men, such as Czerski, Theiner, and Wigand, have joined the movement, and imparted the salutary influence which their sound scriptural views and personal piety are calculated to exert.

Like many others, Dr. Massie was at first disposed to take a more favourable view of the *present character* of the movement than its real merits appear to justify. That it will be ultimately overruled for the advancement of truth and liberty, there can scarcely be a doubt; but to suppose that it has in it, the essential elements of the Reformation carried on by Martin Luther and his associates, is not borne out by the facts which have come under our notice. Dr. Massie, in his concluding note, has guarded against being misunderstood.

'By some of my readers,' he says, 'I may be thought to have taken too favourable a view of the *present* religious movement and its leaders in Germany. A more mature discussion of the subject would afford a clearer index of my thoughts and inquiries; and I cannot hesitate to avail myself of a communication from a friend, recently a witness of the work and the labourers. His opinions may be useful to others. He found it difficult to sympathize with the movement on account of its *Rationalism*. He says, 'With but few exceptions (amongst whom Czerski deserves honourable mention, the more especially as he has left that body, and is tolerably orthodox, considering all things) these 'Reformers' are Neologists. The speculations of 'certain journalists' about the real character of this movement are grievously at fault. The fact is undeniable that

Rongé and Kerbler, at least, deny the inspiration of the Bible, the deity of Christ, and the atonement, as fully as ever Belsham did. There is far more political and theological liberalism in the affair than religion.'

'This is sad, indeed; but I have the best evidence of its truth. To compare Rongé's agitation to Luther's is preposterous. It is admitted that both are antagonistic to popery; but so were, likewise the leaders of the French Revolution. 'But the Confessions?' Confessions of faith are worth no more in Germany than at Oxford, nor so much even; for subscription is not obligatory. I have attended an ordination of one of their priests, where the only profession was a series of negations, which any Socinian might have declared.'

'The state and tendency of the German mind differ much in the nineteenth century from what they were in the sixteenth. Perhaps something may be ascribed to these differences in the religious revolutions and developments of the present times.'—p. 548.

The friends of republican protestantism have been alarmed by the aggregation of catholic citizens in the state of Geneva, and the increased influence, if not ascendancy, of the papal sect in the home of Calvin. The connection between the church and the state has *therefore* become to them odious, and the source of apprehension. Good has thus been deduced out of evil. Fear has come in aid of the truth, and preparations are made for the crisis to which, in common with the other states of Christendom, Geneva is doomed. This miniature republic, with its manageable ecclesiastical establishment, has tested the compulsory principle, and it is in a suggestive, rather than a polemical strain, that Dr. Massie brings under review some of the most momentous considerations connected with the subject which is destined to become *the question of questions*, not only in Britain, but throughout the continent. We commend to the special attention of our readers that portion of his volume which commences on the four hundred and thirty-fifth page, and lay aside the work with a pleasing impression of the variety and value of the details it furnishes. *

Many of our readers had the pleasure of hearing the substance of the volume from the living voice of the author. We hope that *the book* will be as highly appreciated as were *the lectures*, and that it will find a place in many libraries. It well deserves an extensive circulation.

Art. VII.—*A Bill, intituled, An Act for securing the due Administration of Charitable Trusts in England and Wales. Presented by the Lord Chancellor. Ordered to be printed, 19th February, 1846.*

JOHN SINGLETON COPLEY, Baron Lyndhurst,—a name rarely seen in subscription lists,—is unable to repress his solicitude for the due administration of charitable trusts! It reminds us of the traitor apostle's anxiety for the poor. Simply to save expense and to check abuses, has the noble and learned lord introduced this bill into parliament. Let us see how he proposes to achieve these ends; and, in order that we may have some chance of understanding the process, let us endeavour to reduce the confused and cumbrous clauses of the bill into the form of analytical digest.

The bill contains sixty-two clauses. It creates a new court, with extensive powers and few and feeble checks. The pretexts for this proceeding are, first, that in numerous cases property of small amount is held subject to charitable trusts in England and Wales, and it is expedient to provide for the due administration of such property, without incurring the expense of proceedings in courts of equity for that purpose (Clause 1); and, secondly, that, in order the more effectually to check abuses in the administration of property subject to charitable trusts, it is proper that regular accounts should be kept of the receipt and expenditure of such property, and that such accounts should from time to time be inspected and examined (1).

The appointment of numerous officers for the purposes of the proposed act, is provided for in clauses 1, 4, 6, 51. These officers are to consist of three commissioners, a secretary, two inspectors, 'clerks, messengers, and officers,' without limitation, and 'a clerk of each trust,' as we read in the margin. The appointments of commissioners and inspectors are to be gazetted (5). No person, while he holds 'any office or employment' under the proposed act, is to practise as a barrister or as a solicitor or attorney (7).

The three commissioners are to be appointed originally and in continuance by the Lord Chancellor, to be styled 'The Commissioners of Charities,' and to hold their offices during good behaviour (1). Every commissioner is to be a person either holding or having held the office of vice-chancellor or of master in chancery, or having held the office of chief justice of the Supreme Court in Bengal, or a sergeant or barrister-at-law in actual practice, and of not less than twelve years' standing at the bar (2). Resignation of the office of master in chancery is not to disqualify a commissioner (*ibid.*),—a superfluous proviso, by the way, since the clause renders those who are, and those

who have been masters, alike eligible. Commissioners are to take oath, that they 'will faithfully, impartially, and honestly, according to the best of their skill and judgment, fulfil all the powers and duties' of their office (5). They are to be salaried officers; such of them as may be or may have been vice-chancellor, master in chancery, or chief justice in Bengal, to receive, in addition to the salary or retiring pension connected with those offices respectively, a further salary under the bill (3).

The jurisdiction of the commissioners is to be partly summary and partly limited. Their summary jurisdiction is specially provided for in clauses 10, 13, 14, 18, 19, 22, 30; their limited jurisdiction, in clauses 20, 21, 22, 23, 27, 53. Their summary jurisdiction is confined to cases in which the clear yearly revenue of the charity does not exceed one hundred pounds (10). Their limited jurisdiction extends to all charitable trusts whatsoever, excepting only the universities of Oxford and Cambridge, and the colleges and halls within the same, which, by clause 59, are specially exempted from the operation of the bill.

The *powers of the commissioners* are stated in clauses 2, 10, 12, 13, 14, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 25, 27, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 45, 46, 47, 50, 53, 56. They are to 'have the superintendence and control of charitable trusts' (2). The acts of 'any two of the commissioners' are to be valid (8).

With respect to any charity not exceeding a hundred pounds a year, if the commissioners shall, by the petition in writing of any informant, or by the report of any inspector, or otherwise, be informed of any neglect, abuse, or breach of trust in the management of such charity, or in the administration of its estate or funds, or of the want of a sufficient scheme for the application of its revenues, they are empowered, after such notice as they shall deem fit, to cite before them the parties accused, or the trustees of the charity in question, and to summon, by precepts under their seal (provided for in clause 8), and examine, any person or persons whomsoever in relation thereto; to hear and determine summarily the matter; to make thereon, at their pleasure, an order for the payment, with or without interest, of any money belonging to the charity, in the hands of any person connected with its administration, or for the payment of interest, with or without rests, on balances improperly retained in hand, or for the future administration of the trust; or to make any other order respecting the property or the objects of the charity; or, with the written consent of the special visiter if any, to establish, at their pleasure, a new scheme for the application of the revenues; every such order to be final and conclusive, and not subject to any review, unless the commissioners themselves shall think fit to rehear; the commissioners, for the purpose

(not *purposes*) aforesaid, to hold their sitting at, or as near to the locality of the charity as they shall judge expedient (10). In every case within their summary jurisdiction, in which it shall appear to them that a charity is without trustees legally appointed, or that the property is not duly vested in the persons actually administering it, or that, by reason of the reduced number of the trustees, or of other causes, a valid appointment of new trustees cannot be made without application to the Court of Chancery, they are to be empowered to appoint any person or persons as trustees, either alone or jointly with trustees previously existing (13). In the exercise of their summary jurisdiction, they are to be authorised, upon proof, *to their satisfaction*, of any abuse, breach of trust, or neglect of duty, by any trustee, or in the event of any trustee being incapable of acting or desiring his discharge, to remove such trustees, and thereupon, or on the death of any trustee, to appoint any 'new or other trustees, or trustee;' the written consent of special visitors (if any) being necessary, in order to all such removals and appointments (14). Still within the bounds of their summary jurisdiction, they are to be at liberty (but not without the written concurrence of special visitors, if any), upon proof, *to their satisfaction*, that any schoolmaster or mistress, or other officer of any charity, has been negligent in performing his or her duties, or that he or she is unfit or incompetent to discharge them properly, either from immoral conduct, age, or any other cause whatsoever, to empower the trustees to remove such schoolmaster or mistress, or other officer, under such conditions as to them (the commissioners) shall appear proper (18). Again, in cases of summary jurisdiction, whenever it shall appear to them that property given or subject to any charitable trust, cannot be applied to the purposes directed by and according to the intention of the donor thereof, they are to have authority, on application from the majority of the trustees, and with the written consent of the special visitors (if any), to settle or approve a scheme for the application of the property to any charitable purposes that they (the commissioners) shall think fit (19). In the case of all charities of not more than a hundred pounds yearly value, they are to be at liberty, not merely to inquire into the receipt and application of the revenues, but also to make inquiry, inspection, and examination into the administration of them (22). In like cases, they are to have power, whenever they deem the funds of a charity insufficiently secured from misappropriation or loss, to order the transfer thereof to the account of the accountant-general, for investment, in his name, in bank annuities (30).

With respect to charitable trusts in general, the commissioners are to be invested with the various powers now about

to be stated. Upon application from a majority of trustees, they may, with the consent (it is not here said *written*) of the special visiter (if any) direct the sale, mortgage, or exchange of lands, rents, or other hereditaments, or the grant of building or other leases, or the working of mines, or the raising of stone, clay, or gravel, whenever beneficial to the charity; may, at their pleasure, appoint surveyors or other persons to examine such applications; and may connect with the transactions such conditions, restrictions, and directions as they shall deem proper (12). They may sanction, at their pleasure, the definitive compromise of claims in behalf of charities, against any person or corporation, in respect of any neglect, abuse, or breach of trust, or in relation to any property subject or *alleged to be subject* to any charitable trust (20). They may make, rescind, and alter, at their pleasure, regulations, as to the form and manner of the accounts to be kept and rendered, and the returns to be made, by trustees and others, and the transmission and production of accounts and vouchers; provided such regulations be forwarded 'to the clerk, *if any*, of such charitable trust' (21),—(Clause 5 empowering them to make the appointment of a clerk imperative on each trust). Any one or more of them (or the inspectors under their authority) may make inquiry into the receipt and application of the revenues of *any* charitable trust in England and Wales (22); may call for and inspect all books of account, vouchers, and other documents concerning such revenues and the receipt and application thereof; may require the attendance of any person acting as trustee, master, officer, or servant of *any* such charity, or as manager or receiver of any estates or revenues subject to *any* charitable trust, or concerned in the administration thereof, or receiving any salary, emolument, or benefit from *any* charitable trust; and may demand from any such person answers, orally or in writing, to *any* questions, and, generally, all the information possessed by such person in relation thereto, as they may think fit to exact (23). Any one or more of them (or the inspectors under their authority) may examine parties upon oath (25). Stock or money passed, with their approbation, by trustees or others acting in behalf of charities, to the account of the accountant-general, is to be 'in trust to attend the orders of the commissioners' (27). All dividends accruing from such investments are to be 'subject to the order of the commissioners' (29, 31), and no payment is to be legal without an order signed by two of them (32). Stock may be sold and the proceeds re-invested in like manner (33), the secretary certifying the stock to be sold and the person to whom (34, 35). They may, on the petition in writing of not

less than ten inhabitant householders, appoint trustees of municipal charities, where no application has been made to the Lord Chancellor for the appointment of trustees under the Municipal Corporations Act (45). They may, on the like application, add to the number of trustees of municipal charities, whenever it shall appear that 'the existing number of such trustees does not secure a fair or impartial administration of the income of such estate or funds according to the true intent of the trust;' and they are to have the 'sole power' of appointing new or additional trustees, in cases under the Municipal Corporations Act, excepting that, whenever trustees are removed by the Court of Chancery, that court is to supply the vacancies (47). The commissioners may, 'if they shall so think fit,' re-consider, within two months, any of their orders or proceedings, every such re-hearing to take place before all the commissioners (50). They are to report what charities have in their opinion ceased to be beneficial or have become injurious, and also to state such as require to be regulated and reformed (53). They may require abstracts, or copies of, or extracts from conveyances and assurances, wills or muniments of title, concerning any charity, to be transmitted to their office (56).

It will be the *duty* of the commissioners to cause the examinations taken before them, and all papers and documents connected therewith, to be transmitted to their office (24), which is to be in London or Westminster (8); and also, 'at successive periods in every three years,' (a somewhat indefinite direction,) to submit to Her Majesty reports of the revenues and expenditure of all charities subject to their control and inspection, distinguishing the revenues applicable to education, the number of masters (and, we suppose, of mistresses also) employed, and the number of scholars educated, in whole or in part, by the several charitable trusts (53).

The commissioners are to have the *privilege* of giving full effect to their appointments of trustees, without any deed of conveyance (15),—an enactment needlessly repeated in clause 46.

The orders of the commissioners are to be subject to some *limitations*. Besides their inability to perform certain acts without the concurrence of special visitors, where such officers exist, (as in clauses 10, 14, 18, 19,) the established church, as well as the universities of Oxford and Cambridge, is exempted from their authority. In the case of 'any charity for the purpose of education in connexion with the united church of England and Ireland,' (be it observed, the bill extends only to *England and Wales*,—1,61), or which, in the absence of any sufficient scheme, has, for the last twenty-five years, been deemed to

be a charity in connexion with the united church of England and Ireland, and administered as such, if there be not any special visiter, the consent of the bishop of the diocese shall be required in order to the validity of any new scheme, in like manner as though he were a special visiter appointed in the instrument of foundation (10, 19).

But the most remarkable case in which the established church is *favoured* by this bill, is to be found in CLAUSE XLVIII., which it would scarcely be an exaggeration to describe as AN ATTEMPT TO REVIVE THE TEST AND CORPORATION ACTS. We transcribe this infamous clause without abridgment:—

‘ XLVIII. And be it enacted, That in every Case of a Charitable Trust for the Benefit of Persons being Members of the United Church of England and Ireland, or for educating exclusively Persons being Members thereof, *or for the Establishment, Maintenance, or Support of Religious Education or Religious Worship according to the Principles of such Church, or for any other Purpose connected therewith, no Trustee to be appointed under this Act shall be capable of acting in the Execution of such Trust until he shall have made and signed a Declaration in Writing* before some Judge of one of the Superior Courts at Westminster, or before some Justice of the Peace, which Declaration shall be in the Form and shall be attested in the Manner following; (that is to say,)

‘ [A. B. do declare, That I am *really and bonâ fide* a Member of the United Church of England and Ireland as by Law established.

(Signed) A. B.

‘ Signed and declared this Day of in the
‘ Year of our Lord at in the County of
‘ before me C.D., One of the Judges of
‘ [or One of the Justices of the Peace for , as the
‘ Case may be].’

And every such Declaration shall be thereupon transmitted by such Judge or Justice of the Peace to the Office of the Clerks of the Petty Bag, who shall forthwith file the same in the High Court of Chancery, and no Fee shall be payable in respect of such filing thereof: Provided always, that *the Concurrence of any such Trustee not making and signing such Declaration with the other Trustees shall not be necessary in order to the Validity of any Act to be done or Instrument to be executed in the Administration of such Charitable Trust.*

The orders of the commissioners appointing trustees of municipal charities, are to be subject to appeal to the Lord Chancellor on the petition of any five or more inhabitant householders (49).

On the subject of excepted matters, it may be added, that the bill is not to dispense with the admittance of trustees to copyholds, &c., nor to affect the right to heriots, fines, &c. (16); and that, save in cases comprehended under clause 20, it is not

to affect proceedings now pending relative to charitable trusts (60).

The clauses relating to the secretary are, 9, 34, 35 ; to the inspectors, 4, 5, 9, 22—25 ; to other officers, 9.

The expenses that will be incurred under the bill are provided for in clauses 54, 55. A fund is to be created, entitled, 'The Charity Administration Fund.' To this fund the revenues of every charity within the provisions of the bill, 'except such as shall be specially exempted by any order of the commissioners,' are to pay, annually, 'such sum,—not exceeding, in the case of any charity within the summary jurisdiction of the commissioners, *threepence in the pound* ; and, in the case of every other charity not exceeding *one penny halfpenny in the pound*, on the net annual amount of revenue applicable to the purposes of such charity, respectively, *and not exceeding in any case the sum of one hundred pounds*,—as the commissioners shall direct' (54) ; whatever is deficient to be made up by the lords of the Treasury out of the consolidated fund (55). The said 'Charity Administration Fund' is to be applicable to the payment of the salaries of the commissioners, (which are to be fixed by parliament—3,) and of other officers, (to be fixed by the lords of the Treasury—9) and of all such expenses of the commissioners and their officers as the lords of the Treasury shall authorize to be paid thereout, and all such expenses of suits and proceedings in relation to charities of small amount in value as the commissioners shall authorize to be paid thereout (54).

The bill contains several *penal clauses*—26, 40—43. Any person who, upon examination before the commissioners or the inspectors, shall wilfully and corruptly give false evidence, is to be subject to the pains and penalties of perjury (26). Any person summoned to appear before one or more of the commissioners, or before an inspector, who shall wilfully omit or refuse to appear, or to be sworn, or to answer fully any lawful question, is to be liable to the payment of such fine as the Court of Queen's Bench or of Exchequer shall think fit to impose (40). Any master, officer, or servant of a charity, or any manager or receiver of charity estates or revenues, or any person receiving any salary, emolument, or benefit, from any charitable trust, who shall prevent or in anywise obstruct any commissioner or inspector, or refuse or neglect to give answers, orally or in writing, to their lawful questions, or neglect or refuse to obey their summons, is to be deemed guilty of misbehaviour in his office, and to be subject to removal, on application to the Court of Chancery, which is to make such order with respect to the application, and to the costs, as it shall deem just (41). All trustees refusing or neglecting to obey the directions of the bill

and of the commissioners under it, are to be deemed guilty of a breach of trust, and to be subject to removal, on application to the Court of Chancery, the costs, if the court shall so direct, to be paid by the offending trustees (42). Obedience to the commissioners' orders are to be enforced by the Court of Chancery, at the expense of those who shall refuse or neglect to obey them (43).

To complete the analysis of the bill, it needs only be added, that the poor privileges conceded to the public are contained in clauses 10, 45, 47, 49, 50, 56; that municipal charities are affected by clauses 44—47; that the power and jurisdiction of the Lord Chancellor and the Court of Chancery, are referred to in clauses 1, 2, 37, 41—43, 47, 60; that clauses 8, 11, 17, 24—27, 46, relate to questions of evidence, and clauses 10, 15, 21, 27—39, 52, 58, to matters of account; that in clauses 56 and 57 provision is made for the registry and safe custody of deeds relating to charities; and that in clause 62 the usual power is reserved to alter or amend the bill, should it become an act, in the same session of parliament.

Let trustees, and others connected with the administration of charitable trusts, ponder the proposed enactments of this unconstitutional bill, and judge for themselves whether it does not behove them, out of self-respect, and consideration for the charities with which they are connected, to give to it their prompt, energetic, and uncompromising opposition. It contains no definition whatever of what constitutes a charitable trust. This is, no doubt, purposely omitted, in order that the clauses may allow of the utmost latitude of interpretation and application. So far from any attempt being made to narrow the operation of the bill, and confine it strictly to charities in the proper sense of that word, funds merely '*alleged* to be subject to charitable trusts' are brought in express terms within the sweep of its all-embracing clauses. It appears to comprehend every fund created, whether by endowment, bequest, or subscription, for the benefit of others than the parties so creating it: all charities, thus understood, large and small, ancient and modern, national, municipal, or parochial, secular or religious, for foreign or for domestic purposes. It will affect all hospitals, all universities, colleges, and schools (save those specially exempted), all almshouses and eleemosynary doles, all funds for general education or religious instruction, all literary funds, artists' funds, artists' general benevolent societies, and other professional charities, all religious endowments, all chapels and school-houses settled in trust. Every institution which any one portion of the inhabitants of England and Wales have established or may establish, for the

benefit of any other persons, will be subject to it. With all of them it will most annoyingly and vexatiously interfere, and over most exert a complete and irreversible control. It is impossible to calculate the immense amount of property which will be placed at the disposal of this close and absolute tribunal, or even the number of individuals that this unconstitutional triumvirate will have at their mercy. The money may be reckoned by millions, and the men by tens of thousands. Happy the trustees that are shielded by a special visiter, or can flee for refuge to episcopal skirts! But all else may be thrown, by a common informer, or any more infamous agency, into the hands of these commissioners, or their prowling and prying inspectors. These modern inquisitors may summon and examine what witnesses they please, attach what importance to their evidence they think proper, decide as they will, make orders without end, divert and pervert the trusts according to their whim (than which no evil now existing can be worse), and all without appeal, except to themselves, and that only when they think fit to revise their own judgments. The 'sole powers' given them over municipal charities will seriously affect the political independence of many parliamentary boroughs.

No distinction is made between the good and the bad; between those charities for the right government of which no adequate security exists, and those which are governed by parties who have an obvious and a direct interest in their just administration. Indeed, it makes the good pay for the bad, or, rather, makes the alleged mal-administration of certain small charities (taxed, by the bye, in a ratio inverse to their value) serve as an excuse for mulcting charities of larger amount, which it does not even pretend to suspect of mal-administration. Because some rural rector has contrived to divert into his own pocket funds bequeathed for the education of the poor of the parish, therefore these commissioners are to divert into their pockets a hundred pounds of voluntary contributions for special objects. Because the poor in 'Little Pedlington' have been robbed by generations of trustees, the London Missionary Society is to be called upon to pay £100 per annum to the 'Charity Administration Fund.' Talk of robbing Peter to pay Paul! this is Judas robbing both to pay himself.

The bill is inquisitorial, and that most where least defensible and least necessary. In its estimation, a special visiter charity is precisely that sort of charity which 'hideth a multitude of sins;' while the voucher of a bishop warrants the presumption of a purity equal to that of his own lawn; but every charity whose door is not thus guarded, falls a prey to this burglarious bill, and the awe-struck inmates must disclose all their affairs, on pain of—no one knows what. Our great societies publish their

annual reports, which satisfies the subscribers; but this new triumvirate of bureaucratic kings will extort a great deal more from them, and make them pay for it in the bargain.

The bill is an intolerable insult to the great body of generous and disinterested trustees, who pay instead of receiving, by supposing them capable of misapplying funds, the particular destination of which has, in numberless cases, originated with themselves, while, in nearly all, they are the largest and most constant contributors. 'I belong,' says a correspondent of the *Times* newspaper, 'to a society or social club of professional persons of upwards of fifty years' duration, one of whose members died a few years back, and left a liberal sum to the club to be disposed of by them in charitable purposes, entirely at their discretion. I need scarcely say, that the services of the parties in charge of the fund are gratuitous; and thus, by its passing into the hands of strangers, who will be paid for their services, its humble funds will be diminished, and the society dispossessed of their right.'—This is but one instance of many hundreds, in which the operation of the bill will be thus unjust and prejudicial. Let there be the least probability of such a measure becoming law, and tens of thousands of trustees will either wind up the affairs with which they are thus connected, or will anticipate the odious interference of these paid commissioners, by withdrawing. Those that have no motive for acting in this capacity but the promotion of a benevolent or other good design, will not submit to the degradation of being under the surveillance of this new police. The very existence of many excellent and important charities will be perilled; for, through disgust at the wolfish scheme of fleecing under pretence of protecting them, funds derived from annual subscriptions will be subject to serious fluctuations, and the directors of such institutions will no longer be able to keep faith with those for whose subsistence they have pledged themselves, in full reliance upon the steady flow of public liberality. For similar reasons, the bill will discourage the reviving habit of making charitable bequests, and will deter prudent managers of institutions mainly dependent upon annual subscribers, from fortifying them against contingencies, by reserving a portion of their income for investment in the funds.

In short, the proceeding is altogether indefensible. If, for example, because some charities have been abused, all institutions that the elastic name can by any stretching be made to cover, are to be taxed and overhauled, official assignees might as well be clothed with authority to examine all men's ledgers, because there are some bankrupts, and those bankrupts' affairs ought to be set right at the expense of solvent traders. In one word, the bill is a job, and the proposed com-

mission may be justly regarded as forming a capacious reservoir, into which tens of thousands of charities are to empty their tributary rills. It is an expensive scheme for curtailing expense,—an unjust mode of doing justice,—an uncharitable way of promoting charity. These are doubtless heavy accusations; but the more the bill is examined, the more evident will be the fact that they are richly merited.

It fails at starting. It does not accomplish the legitimate object, while aiming at objects that are not legitimate. We need not go into the history of the Charity Commission,—that leviathan affair, whose labours consumed twenty years, and whose report fills more than twice as many volumes. It results from those prolonged inquiries, that there are as many as forty thousand charities of less than £100 annual value each, their average value not exceeding £30 a year, seven thousand of them being under £5, and six thousand under £3 a year, and the yearly income of three thousand five hundred of them ranging from twenty shillings to one shilling. The right administration of these forty thousand small charities is the ostensible object of the bill. Doubtless, a process applicable to such cases, less expensive and less tardy than the existing regulations of the Court of Chancery admit of, may be desirable. The question is, whether the bill under review supplies the desideratum. Our belief is, that its exempting clauses defeat its object. No charities which have a special visiter, none which are, or for five-and-twenty years have been *deemed to be* identified with the established church, can be touched, without the consent of the visiter in the one case, or of the bishop of the diocese in the other. We should not be surprised to find, that these provisions exclude from the operation of the measure, at least three-fourths of those charities which have furnished the only plausible plea for its introduction. Besides the low average value of these trusts, they are scattered through almost every parish in England and Wales. How can three gentlemen resident in London, with a couple of inspectors and no matter how many clerks, deal advantageously with such a case? By the bill, the one shilling and the twenty shilling charities must continue to be separately administered. For the future, the administrators will be subject to the commission alone. Their large numbers, scattered over the whole face of the country, would render the surveillance merely nominal. And, at all events, the bill contains not one syllable to make the commissioners responsible for the fulfilment of their duties.

Various remedies have been suggested for the admitted evil, the worst of which is far better than this futile, though mis-

chievous bill. For example, a number of these trivial charities might be consolidated under one management, with provision for due publicity; and the administrators might be made elective. Or, an easy method of redress, by appeal to the ordinary courts, might be afforded to all parties interested in the proper administration of the charities. Or, a bill might be brought in to facilitate and simplify proceedings in equity. Why not, as has been suggested by a professional gentleman who understands the subject well, disallow fees to counsel on the preparation and signature of petitions, render the concurrence of the attorney-general, where now required, unnecessary, only allow one counsel at the hearing, reduce or abolish court fees, reduce the scale of payments in the master's office, or abolish them entirely in cases of a certain limited amount, render a report from the master unnecessary, or, if not, simplify the process, and let the suitor go at once to the court and get his order, and let that order vest the property in the persons approved by the master, and thus obviate the necessity for a conveyance. Some such measure as this would accomplish every desirable object, in relation to the diminution of expense. What is wanted is, an appropriate judicial process, combining cheapness with publicity and responsibility. The Lord Chancellor's bill is the very opposite of all these. It erects a secret court. To that court it gives absolute authority, legislative as well as judicial and administrative, without appeal on the one hand, or responsibility on the other. And, certainly, any thing but cheap.

Threepence in the pound on charities under £100, and three-half-pence in the pound on those of higher value, limited though the tax may be, in the latter case, to £100 each, will yield no trifling amount of money; and yet, that this is deemed insufficient, may be fairly inferred from the clause enacting that any deficit shall be paid out of the consolidated fund. If we consider how many and what sort of salaries will have to be paid, we shall soon see that it must be an expensive affair, and that it was necessary to extend the principle of spoliation as well as of arbitrary interference to the larger charities, in order to raise any thing like enough for the purposes of the job. The amount of the commissioners' salaries is in blank; the House of Lords having no power to fill it up, though, strangely enough, that house has, or assumes power to impose a tax on all charitable trusts,—the more important part of the money matter. We may guess, however, how many figures will ultimately occupy the vacant space. Vice-chancellors and masters in chancery are the class of men made eligible for the commissionerships. Now, the Vice-chancellor of England receives £6,000 a year; the other two vice-chancellors, £5,000 each; and the dozen masters, £2,500 a piece. If any of these gentlemen accepts a com-

missionership, he is to have something beyond his present salary. Should any of them be appointed, and not resign their present places, it would be a proof that they have not now enough to do,—a contingency which at once suggests the possibility of superseding the bill altogether, by devolving upon them, under some suitable arrangement, the business it involves. If, however, the contrary is the fact, and any of them should accept appointments under the bill, it is not to be supposed that they would make a change disadvantageous to themselves. Indeed, it is rumoured that Master Lynch and Master Brougham are already marked out for the new offices (Sir Edward Ryan being understood to be the lucky ex-chief-justice of Bengal, made eligible by the bill). We may consequently conclude, that the mere salaries of the three commissioners will nearly swallow up £10,000 a year; and the stipends of inspectors, secretary, clerks, managers, and officers, with travelling and other expenses, will go very far towards doubling the amount.

And for what purpose is the public charity to be taxed to the tune of some £20,000 per annum? To facilitate the establishment of a new, secret, absolute, and irresponsible tribunal, from whose decisions there will be no appeal, and which, from the nature of its constitution and functions, can never hope to possess public confidence. Indeed, the whole thing might have been framed for the purpose of provoking opposition. What else can be the result of proposing to compel the most powerful companies, societies, and institutions in the metropolis, in common with all trustees of all other charities, to deposit in the office of the commissioners, at their own expense, attested copies of all the deeds of charities entrusted to their management, and to exact annual accounts of the special application of each? What can be more vexatious or uncalled for? Again, the commissioners will be empowered to compel every land-owner, out of whose estate a rent-charge, or other payment, however small, for a charitable purpose, arises, to proclaim to all the world the state of his title at the passing of the bill; to verify it from the date of the instrument creating the charity, and to register in their office all conveyances, leases, etc., in any way concerning his estate. This, surely, will not help the bill through a landlords' parliament! The manner in which it has been received by the governors of the royal hospitals and some other powerful companies, affords it but little promise of success. It is hardly to be supposed, that a body of gentlemen who have given among them a quarter of a million of money for the purposes of the charities they superintend, will continue this rate of liberality for the pleasure of being ordered from pillar to post by an ex-master in chancery, or a briefless barrister of twelve years' standing.

The most material point, however, is that which relates to

trustees. This bill, we beg them to bear in mind, is for their benefit! Its objects are to give them new facilities, and at less expense! And how is all this to be accomplished? Thus. By rendering them liable to answer on oath to unsworn informations. Ordinary witnesses cannot be compelled to travel more than ten miles, but unhappy trustees must obey the summons of these lords commissioners, though they travel from one end of the kingdom to the other. All their books, vouchers, and documents, must be forthcoming whenever called for. They must not flinch from any question put to them. The penalties of perjury hang over them. An unlimited fine, with the agreeable alternative of imprisonment, awaits the refractory. The Court of Chancery is empowered to enforce the orders of the commissioners at the expense of negligent or disobedient trustees. They must keep a clerk if directed. Their accounts must be according to the commissioners' notions of book-keeping, and liable to examination and audit at their high mightinesses' pleasure. Not only must they furnish the commissioners with copies of their deeds, old and new, to lie open for public inspection; but the deeds themselves must be given up, if required, and copies retained for their own use and at their own expense. To crown all, they are, in a great many instances, wholly at the mercy of the commissioners, removable at their pleasure, and their trusts liable to endless tampering and perversion, as well as to annual taxation. And all this for the benefit of trustees, to afford them fresh facilities, and to diminish their expenses! Why, if any thing like such a bill as this were to become law, a trustee would be the unhappiest man alive.

The fact is, that the only case in which a trust estate can be benefited by the bill is, when a new appointment of trustees becomes necessary,—a case which happens not more than four or five times in a century. Now, what are the facilities? You apply to the commissioners: it must be by petition. The bill does not award trustees the privilege of professional aid when cited before them; but such applications will, in general, be made with legal assistance. An attorney prepares the petition, and there must, as evidence of the deaths of trustees, be certificates of burial, duly verified by affidavit. Thus an expense will be incurred, which, added to the new tax, will probably exceed that of an ordinary appointment by deed. These remarks, be it observed, apply only to the minor class of trusts, in which alone the commissioners will have the power of appointment. The larger class will pay the tax indeed, but not derive the benefit, such as it is: they must proceed as before. It is the fault of trustees themselves, however, if they have to incur in any form the expense of new appointments.

It is certain, that, when the provisions of the bill are well understood, all trustees who apprehend correctly their own interests, will prefer the present mode of administering trust property to the oppressive, inquisitorial, annoying, and expensive mode here proposed. The only clause that is not most offensive towards them, is that which gives them an indemnity for all that they may do under the commissioners' direction.

We desire to call the particular attention of dissenters of all classes to the insulting and injurious aspect which this spoliation bill wears towards them and their interests. The Dissenting Deputies have already pointed out, in their petition to the House of Lords, that, although in a bill, under the same title, introduced into their lordships' house in 1844, provision was made for excluding from its operation, 'any funds applicable to the benefit of Roman Catholics, or of the people called Quakers, or of any person of the Jewish persuasion,' and for leaving such funds 'under the superintendence and control of persons of such persuasions respectively,' and although no petitions have been presented to the legislature from Protestant Dissenters praying for any alteration in the law respecting them; yet the legal operation of this bill will be to include all the chapels of Protestant Dissenters, although the greater part of them are supported by voluntary contributions. This is true enough; but a great deal more than this is true. Not only their chapels, but also their colleges and schools, and all their institutions, are placed in jeopardy. We question whether any minister will be safe in his pulpit should this bill pass. It contains a clause which puts every individual having a beneficial interest in a trust estate completely under the thumb, we had almost written thumbscrew, of the commissioners. Certainly it empowers them to declare existing trusts injurious, and wholly to change their complexion and direction. An orthodox trustee may be displaced to make room for a heterodox one—a good Christian for a rank infidel. The established church is well provided for; but, for dissent and dissenters, there is nothing but pains and penalties. Whatever has, for twenty-five years, been *deemed* to be a church charity, with that no dissenter can have anything to do, any more than if it were, by distinct and positive deed, exclusively a church charity. Here comes in the New Test, quoted above, in all its rigour. No dissenting alderman, town-councillor, or parochial officer, can exercise the rights of citizenship in relation to any of these twenty-five-year-old church charities, much less to those positively such. Far be any dissenter from wishing to intrude into charities really belonging to churchmen as such; but there are numberless municipal and parochial charities notoriously designed to

be administered without distinction of religious parties, which, nevertheless, under this bill, the church will be enabled to claim; and with them no dissenter can interfere who is not prepared to forswear himself and his principles, by solemnly declaring that he is 'really and *bonâ fide* a member of the established church.' By a strange anomaly, the commissioners' oath of office requires no religious test from them; and, in point of fact, there is every probability that the three classes of religionists whom the present Government has exclusively favoured in former measures, will be represented in the very first board of charity commissioners. We refer, of course, to the church of England, the church of Rome, and the Unitarians. Thus it will come to pass, that, while three commissioners of these several religious persuasions may turn all sorts of trusts, evangelical dissenting or otherwise, upside down and inside out, a *new test act*, enacted for the purpose, will for ever prevent any conscientious dissenter from so much as touching a single charity to which the clergy of the establishment can set up a specious claim of five-and-twenty years' possession. A more absurd anomaly or a grosser insult was never perpetrated. Will the legislature establish the system of *exclusive dealing* by act of parliament?

We call upon the dissenters to arouse themselves. Our Wesleyan friends, with their usual sagacity, have perceived the threatening danger, and are on the alert. Their petition to the House of Lords elaborately exposes the mischievous and iniquitous character of this abominable bill. Once passed into a law, it would cut up their compact and smooth-working system by the very roots. Their chapels and other trust premises are settled on a uniform plan, and, we need hardly say, are of immense value. By their law, no trustees, however embarrassed, can sell or mortgage without permission of Conference. What they borrow, must be borrowed on their own personal security. This, in individual cases, may seem hard; but the Conference, having the interests of their vast Connexion to consider, is governed by their judgment rather than swayed by their feelings. Now, this bill would completely break in upon their rule; for, in all cases, great and small, it empowers the commissioners to give relief to distressed trustees by directing a sale, mortgage, or exchange of property. This would utterly derange the affairs of the whole Wesleyan church, to the very existence of which it is absolutely necessary that the Conference should reign in undisturbed supremacy. Again, it is their invariable rule to appoint no trustees but such as are members of their own communion; and the Conference obtained a legal constitution for the very purpose of appointing ministers to the

chapels in their Connexion. Both these essential parts of its economy would be invaded by the bill, which, under given and very possible circumstances, would transfer both these powers to the commissioners; for, as we have seen, the bill empowers them to authorize trustees, 'for any cause whatever,' to discharge any officer of a charity; which, in the case before us, is to make master and servant change places. In short, no such measure could pass into law, without exposing this large and well-organised community to a ruinous and perhaps a speedy revolution. Well might the Committee of Privileges begin their petition to the Peers against it, with the declaration that they view it with 'considerable apprehension and alarm,' and assert that it is 'calculated to undermine and overthrow some of the most important and vital provisions of their body.' Nor can that apprehension and alarm have been mitigated by the opinion which two eminent chancery lawyers appear to have given, to the effect that their missionary society, their theological institution, their book-room, and all their other funds and institutions, will be subject, not merely to taxation—that, though vexatious and oppressive, is a light matter in comparison—but also to the inquisitorial powers of the commissioners and their inspectors, and, through their office, to the world at large. In short, this bill is more to be dreaded by the Wesleyan body than any bill ever brought into parliament, Lord Sidmouth's itself not excepted.

All classes of Nonconformists, Protestant or Catholic, Wesleyans, Presbyterians, Independents, Baptists, and others, have equal cause to complain of the unjust partiality, as well as of the oppressive character of this bill. Why should Oxford and Cambridge be alone exempt? Why should special visiters and bishops *taboo* church charities from the profane touch of the commissioners? On what principle should such charities be protected, while Nonconformist trusts are exposed to the unrestricted control of this unconstitutional and irresponsible triumvirate? If a declaration of churchmanship is demanded from the trustees of church charities, why should not a declaration of Wesleyanism be required from trustees of Wesleyan chapels—of Independency, from those of Independent chapels, and so on? The Toleration Act, and all similar statutes, are a mockery, a delusion, and a snare, unless as much respect be paid by the legislature to the trust property of all classes of Nonconformists as to that of the established church itself. Add to all, the commissioners may, if they choose, exempt all church charities from the taxing clause of the bill; and, judging from its partial complexion throughout, they probably will.

Happy will it be if the different spirit, in which on this, as on

many former occasions, it has been proposed to deal with churchmen and with dissenters, should wake the latter to a due sense of their danger and a due appreciation of their principles. This perpetual meddling with religious interests, carried further at every fresh attempt, can be effectually arrested and put down, only by the entire separation of the church from the state. This bill ought to be resisted by all classes, because of its unconstitutional, jobbing, vexatious, and mischievous character; but it deserves the strenuous opposition of dissenters on account of its atrociously sectarian bias: and yet, so long as exclusive privileges are conferred upon a favoured sect, measures equally bad, if not worse, must be expected, as the natural fruit of such a vicious system of legislation. 'To them that have will be given.' The appetite will grow by that it feeds on; and poor human nature will always delight in adding more privileges to those who already enjoy so many. The union of church and state is the animating principle, the life and soul, of this bill. Let it pass, and it will entail a numerous kindred brood. As infallibly as one triumvirate of commissioners has led to more, will this Charitable Trusts Bill, which lays its sacrilegious hands upon every farthing vested in trust, be followed by other bills pleading the precedent for government interference with popular and voluntary institutions, till at length we shall have no security whatever for doing what we like with our own. Government will utterly consume us: we shall be first worried, and then devoured.

Brief Notices.

Elements of General History, Ancient and Modern, to which are added, a Comparative View of Ancient and Modern Geography, and a Table of Chronology. By Alexander Fraser Tytler; Lord Woodhouslee. A new edition, with additions, and a continuation from 1688 to the present time. Edited by the Rev. Brandon Turner, M.A. London. 12mo. 1846.

THIS respectable manual is decidedly improved in the present edition. But it is proper to remark, that room still exists for more improvement. Admirable as all the summaries of history are, the inaccuracies, and even omissions, are frequent. For example, in a very valuable part of the work—the *comparative view of ancient and modern geography*—ALL the divisions of France into *departments*, are left out, although the page would conveniently have contained them. Then in the list of the old provinces of France, Cambresis

and Artois stand opposite to a tribe called by a gross error of the press, the *Artnebrates*, instead of the 'Atrebates.' Besides the error, surely neither the author of the manual, nor his respectable editor, can be unaware, that our old connections, the *Morini*, with some half dozen tribes more, belonged, in ancient days, to the modern Cambresis and Artois. In this place it is also a grave mistake to call modern Picardy, Artois, etc., 'Gallia,' as the manual does (p. 243), in contradistinction to ancient Belgium. Again, it seems to be an error to call the Frisii, 'Frisi,' and a more serious one to place the old *Treveri* at 'Namur,' instead of their venerable capital, Trèves. The whole of this chapter requires very careful revision.

A great mistake, of another sort, seems to be committed in the section xli. (p. 171) on Carthage. Generally the work is correctly limited to a perspicuous statement of facts. In this passage an *opinion* is expressed that the Carthaginian principle mentioned by Aristotle, against *one* person holding *several* employments, is censurable, because such plurality is 'both expedient and necessary.' We had thought, with Blackstone, that on the contrary, this principle is good in itself, as it certainly, according to the same high authority, is an English principle, however often infringed. Again, the manual here says, that another Carthaginian principle by which the poor were debarred from all offices of trust, or importance, was wise, 'for in offices of trust poverty offers too powerful an incitement to deviation from duty.' We venture to suggest a reconsideration of this point, and that in a new edition of the manual (which we are sure will be called for), the learned and judicious author and editor prepare a chapter in the History of England on the law of Richard II., c. 12, which expressly enacts that offices of trust be bestowed on the *most worthy*, without one word as to wealth constituting a sign of worth.

An omission of importance occurs in the history of France, viz., as to the *Mississippi Bubble*. Our South Sea bubble is properly mentioned (p. 483). Why is the other left out? Both were equally important events, and intimately connected. Both should be stated in all histories of England and France, for this reason, that whilst the Mississippi bubble helped to lay the foundation of the revolution in France, the South Sea bubble, bad as it was in all other respects, produced no lasting injury to England. The causes of the distinction lie deep in the constitution of the two countries.

With these few friendly censures, we leave the book, with warm recommendations, as one of the most useful to be found for daily reference.

The Native Irish, and their Descendants. By Christopher Anderson. The Third Edition, improved. London: W. Pickering.

A THIRD edition of a very valuable book, carefully revised, and published at half-a-crown only. All who would acquaint themselves with the moral and educational statistics of the Irish people, should give it an attentive perusal.

The Dream of the Lilybell, Tales, and Poems ; with translations of the Hymn to Night. From the German of Novalis ; and Jean Paul's 'Death of an Angel.' By Henry Morley. 12mo. London : Sherwood.

THIS is one of the fruits of the taste and industry of a few young men of King's College, London, published some time ago, and added to from the author's after years of study. Perhaps, not a little too dreamy in the choice of his topics, Mr. Morley, nevertheless, proves himself a true votary of the muse ; and we trust he will zealously pursue his vocation of vindicator of divine poesy in this utilitarian age. The *Lilybell* and the *Ode to beauty*, are charming verses. The author is a true scholar ; and he will not say we are hypercritical in remarking, that he should look a little closer to his correction of the press, when quoting Latin. *Meddocræ*, in the preface, p. vi., is neither good prose, nor good metre ; and it is not the only speck of the kind in a beautifully printed little book.

Lectures on the Pilgrim's Progress, and on the Life and Times of Bunyan.
By Rev. George B. Cheever, D.D. London : Thomas Nelson.
Glasgow : W. Chalmers.

Two neat and cheap editions of a work, which should have an extensive circulation. The Glasgow reprint is certainly to be preferred, though, in its absence, Mr. Nelson's would be an acquisition. Dr. Cheever's is one of the most fascinating books which we have read for a long time, and cannot fail very deeply to interest every admirer of Bunyan.

A Hand-Book for Lewes, with Notices of the recent discoveries at the Priory. By M. A. Lower, author of 'The Curiosities of Heraldry,' &c. &c. London. 12mo. 1846.

MR. LOWER modestly, but we think incorrectly, sets *Guide-Books* at a very 'humble' standard. His own valuable little work, at least, shews that to the historian, the statist, and the lover of the picturesque, local records and scenes may become attractive when in skilful hands. Forty years ago, we roamed among the scenes described by Mr. Lower, and are grateful to him for having called up by his pen and his pencil, the memory of many spots, which time had begun to obliterate. We hope his next edition will have a good map, with the *foot-paths*.

The Church of Scotland Pulpit. Volume First. pp. 373. London : Simpkin & Marshall. 1845.

THIS Volume consists of eighteen sermons by clergymen of the Established church of Scotland. Of course it would be impossible to characterize them without specifying the distinctive features of each. Their general character is evangelical and practical—but

in them as a whole, we do not discern traces of remarkable talent, learning, or eloquence. As ordinary productions of the pulpit, they are respectable, but we do not deem this enough to justify their publication.

Stories of the Primitive and Early Church. By Sophia Woodrooffe. Edited with an Introduction on the subject by G. S. Faber, B.D. pp. 207. Seeley. 1845.

THESE stories were composed, says the editor, for the better training of the elder children in a Sunday-school, and they are now published by Dr. Faber, the uncle of the deceased authoress, with a view to counteract the influence of the *Lives of the English Saints*, which are sent forth by the Romanizing party in the English Church. As to their *original use*, we very much question whether the idea of the fair writer was a good one; and decidedly think, with Dr. Faber, that the style would be *rather* above the comprehension of village children. Looking at them as now presented to the public, we can speak of them in praise. We are sceptical of some things recorded as facts, but rejoice in the sound character of the principles inculcated, and admire the beautiful and classical style, as Dr. Faber justly calls it, in which they are developed. We should say that the editor's contributions to the volume are considerable. He has given an Introduction—many notes—and the last three stories.

The Jesuits: their Origin and Order, Morality and Practices, Suppression and Restoration. By Alexander Duff, D.D. Calcutta. pp. 56. Grombridge. 1845.

A VERY comprehensive and vigorously written account of a mighty and mischievous people, who have occupied, and will yet occupy, a prominent position in ecclesiastical and civil affairs. All Protestants ought to understand them thoroughly, and Dr. Duff's pamphlet will be serviceable to those who wish to do so.

Passages from the Life of a Daughter at home. pp. 157. Seeley. 1845.

A TALE, without any incidents of interest, designed to shew the triumph of Christian principle, and the peace of Christian service, in circumstances less noticeable, but far from being less worthy of note, than many which receive much more attention.

Knight's Penny Magazine. Vol. I. London: Charles Knight & Co.

'THE Penny Magazine' has strong claims on the cordial support of the friends of popular literature. For fourteen years it has held steadily on in its honourable course, and has probably done more than any other publication, to diffuse sound and useful knowledge amongst the great body of our people. During the whole of this period it has been under the editorship of Mr. Knight, and we are glad to find that this is to be continued in the new series, now com-

menced. The connexion of the work with the 'Useful Knowledge' Society has terminated, and the property as well as the editorship has devolved on Mr. Knight. Its form is to be altered, each penny number consisting of sixteen pages instead of eight, with more letter-press on the sheet than formerly, but fewer illustrative wood-cuts. It 'is intended to be for the people of 1846, what the Penny Magazine of the Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge was for the people of 1832.'

We cordially wish success to the undertaking, and strongly advise our readers, especially the younger portion of them, to give orders for this most instructive and interesting periodical to be regularly supplied to them.

Fisher's Gallery of Scripture Engravings, Historical and Landscape. With Descriptions, Historical, Geographical, and Critical. By John Kitto, D.D. Parts I.—V. London: Fisher and Co.

THESE engravings are already familiar to us, having appeared in other publications of the Messrs. Fisher. Their interest, however, is greatly increased, in the present instance, by the literary illustrations furnished by Dr. Kitto. A wiser selection could not have been made. Dr. Kitto is well known, and his name will be received by the public as an earnest of the able and useful execution of his task. Works of the kind thus furnished at a very reasonable cost, and in handsome style, were until recently the exclusive property of the rich. We rejoice in their more extensive circulation, and shall be glad to promote it. The scenes depicted by the old masters are skilfully combined with landscapes by more modern artists, and the two in connection with Dr. Kitto's labours have left little to be desired. The work is issued in quarto on the 1st and 15th of every month. Each part will contain four highly-finished steel engravings at one shilling each.

The Philosophy of History, in a course of Lectures delivered at Vienna. By Frederick Von Schlegel. Translated from the German, with a *Memoir of the Author.* By James Brown Robertson, Esq. Second Edition. Revised. London: Henry G. Bohn.

ANOTHER volume of *The Standard Library*, and well entitled to its place. The readers of history, and our intelligent young men especially, will be glad to avail themselves, through the medium of Mr. Bohn's edition, of the genius and erudition of this distinguished German scholar. The work is now within their means, and may be had at a price which our fathers would have deemed incredible.

France Illustrated. Drawings by Thomas Allom, Esq. Descriptions by the Rev. G. N. Wright, M.A. Division IV. London: Fisher and Co.

THE fourth division of one of the most beautiful drawing-room volumes which has been on our table, for some time past. It con-

tains ten highly-finished engravings, from drawings by Mr. Allom, and has the additional merit of throwing much light on the tradition, history, customs, architecture, and scenery of our continental neighbours. It is published quarterly, at a low price, and is fully worthy of the patronage it seeks. As a work of light reading, at once instructive and entertaining, richly illustrated, and 'got up' in handsome style, it has been rarely surpassed.

Literary Intelligence.

Just published.

Narrative of the exploring Expedition to the Rocky Mountains, in the year 1842, and to Oregon and North California, in the years 1843—1844. By Brevet-Captain J. C. Fremont, of the Topographical Engineers, under the orders of Colonel J. J. Abert, Chief of the Topographical Bureau, with a Map and Illustrations.

Shakspeare's Dramatic Art, and his relation to Calderon and Goethe. Translated from the German of Dr. Hermann Ulric.

A Doctrinal, Experimental, and Practical Treatise on Effectual Calling. By James Foote, A.M.

A Discourse of Matters pertaining to Religion. By Theodore Parker, Minister of the Second Church in Roxbury, Mass.

The Orthodox Doctrine, regarding the extent of the Atonement, vindicated. By Charles Hodge, D.D. With a commendatory Preface, by Rev. Dr. Cunningham, Professor McCrie, Dr. Candlish, and Dr. W. Symington.

The Rise and Fall of Papacy. By the Rev. Robert Fleming, Jun. Edited, with a Memoir of the Author, by the Rev. Thomas Thomson.

The School Hand-Book to the Holy Bible. By Rev. Ingram Cobbin, M.A.

The Step-Mother. By J. P. R. James, Esq. 3 vols.

The History of England during the Thirty-years Peace, 1815 to 1845. By Charles Knight. Part II.

Tracts of the British Anti-State Church Association.

Knight's Penny Magazine, Vol. I.

The Modern Orator. Being a Collection of celebrated Speeches of the most distinguished Orators of the United Kingdom. Edmund Burke.

Political Dictionary. Forming a work of Universal Reference both constitutional and legal, and embracing the terms of Civil Administration of Political Economy and Social Relations, and of all the more important Statistical Departments of Finance and Commerce. Part 12—first half.

Notes, Explanatory and Practical, on the Epistles of Paul to the Thessalonians, to Timothy, to Titus, and to Philemon. By Albert Barnes. Reprinted verbatim from the American copy.

The Life of Luther. Written by himself. Collected and arranged by M. Michelet, Member of the Institute, Author of the 'History of France,' &c. Translated by William Hazlitt, Esq.

Historical View of the Literature of the South of Europe. By J. C. L. Simonde De Sismondi. Translated from the original, with Notes, and a Life of the Author, by Thos. Roscoe. Second edition, including all the Notes from the last Paris edition. Two vols.